Central BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

SEP 23 REC'D

R.R.
UB72
P22
Acc 21302
9/24/52

AN ESSAY

ON THE

MODE AND DESIGN OF

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM;

IN WHICH THE SCRIPTURES

ARE CAREFULLY EXAMINED,

AND MADE THE ONLY BOOK OF APPEAL

FOR POSITIVE PROOF.

BY LEONARD PARKER,
Minister of the M. E. Church.

"Search the Scriptures."
"He that hath ears to hear let him hear.
"Doth our law judge any man before it hear him and know what he doeth."

NEW PHILADELPHIA.
Printed at the Lutheran Standard Office.
1844.

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY 2, KANSAS

265.17
P241

OPINIONS OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY.

"As the doctrines of the Bible are the first principles, and foundation of the christian religion, they should be carefully examined and well understood by every christian, but especially divines should make this their study, because all the various doctrines should be insisted on in public; and explained to the people."—*Buck.*

"The propriety of religious disputation, or controversial divinity has been a matter of doubt with many. Some artfully decry it, in order to avoid free enquiry; some hate it because they do not like to be contradicted, others declaim against it, to save themselves the disgrace of exposing their ignorance, or the labor of examining and defending their own theses. There are others who avoid it, not because they are convinced of the impropriety of the thing itself; but because of the evil temper with which it is generally conducted. The propriety of it will however appear, if we consider that every article of religion is denied by some, and cannot well be believed by any, without examination. Religion empowers us to investigate, debate, and controvert each

21302

article, in order to ascertain the evidence of its truth. The divine writings, many of them are controversial; the book of Job, and Paul's epistles, especially. The ministry of our Lord was a perpetual controversy, and the Apostles came at truth by much disputing.—Acts xv: 7—xvii .17. and xix. 8, 9."—*Buck.*

"The prejudice against religious controversy is irrational and hurtful."—*Dr. Mason.*

"It may be truly affirmed, that the evils of controversy are transient; the good it produces is permanent."—*Robert Hall.*

"Controversies on religious subjects are always deprecated by those who desire the prosperity of religion; but this regret should be confined to the fact that any occasion for controversy should exist. It can be no mark of a christian to consent that errors, calculated to injure the cause of the Redeemer, should be permitted to march triumphantly through the land without interruption."—*Wm. F. Broadus.*

"Controversies when properly conducted must always do good."—*Wm. F. Broadus.*

TO THE READER.

This work, on the subject of the Mode and Design of the Christian Baptism, is designed for the benefit of those, and those only, who in matters of religion, are willing to be guided by the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, believing them to be the only correct standard of Christian Theology.—This work is not designed for, nor will it be any benefit to those who derive their sentiments from human tradition, from the concessions of Paido-baptists, or the dogmatical expressions of Anti-Paido-baptists. As the subject of Baptism was introduced, and spoken of by the different writers of the New Testament, and frequently referred to in the prophecies of the Old, it could not be expected that all that pertained to that subject should be presented to us at one view. And as the passages which relate to the subject of baptism are interspersed throughout almost the whole Bible, it is needless for us to say that a collection of those passages pertaining to that subject will not aid us in forming correct views of the mode and design of christian baptism. And although I profess to de-

rive my views upon this subject, wholly from the Scriptures, yet I confess myself indebted to others, in a measure, for that acquaintance I have with the word of God in relation to this important matter. I would say, however, that I am far more indebted for this information to those who oppose my views of the mode and design of baptism than to any other source beside the sacred oracles. Within the last three years I have held seven public discussions on the mode of baptism, and four, on its design. This circumstance has led to a closer, and more critical examination of this subject in all its bearings, and given me an advantage which many others do not possess. I have undoubtedly had to meet their strongest arguments, and with what success it does not become me to say; this must be decided by those who were present, on those several occasions. Suffice it to say that on all those occasions I have been strongly solicited to publish my arguments on the mode, and design of water baptism. Controversy in relation to baptism, has now assumed a new form. The question is not whether pouring, as the mode of baptism, is admissible on the principle of accommodation; but whether the scriptures authorize any other mode than that of affusion. It is known to the intelligent part of community, that the opposite parties in contending upon this point, have proceeded upon very different principles. While one party has gen-

erally endeavored to sustain the view that no particular mode or manner of administering the ordinance of baptism, was necessary to constitute the validity of christian baptism; the other has taken a different position, declaring that the Scriptures do precisely point out the mode in which it shall be administered to the exclusion of every other mode. And while the advocates of baptism by affusion, have contended for the correctness of that mode; conceding at the same time that the other might be right, (though this concession was made on the ground that the mode was not essential), this very circumstance has been taken advantage of by their opponents, and has been the means of much confident boasting, on the part of the immersionists. And because their arguments were not attacked by the advocates of effusion, with that virulence with which they attacked the arguments of others, they have been induced to believe their arguments invulnerable. Hence they depend much upon the concessions of the other party, and it frequently seems *more* than they do upon the word of God, to sustain their sentiment; and no marvel; for such concessions are very often more in their favor than the authority of God's word. The reader will readily see the difference in the course pursued by me, and that pursued by the immersionist in this controversy. I depend upon no proof but that derived from the sacred oracles, while the immersionist

relies much, (may I not say chiefly) upon the testimony and concessions of uninspired men. In a work called 'Scriptural Guide to Baptism, Published by R. Pengilly, there are between eighty and a hundred witnesses brought forward to sustain his sentiments on the subject of baptism. Yet from the recommendations of the party to the second English, and third American edition we might be led to conclude that the argument was wholly Scriptural. The work comes to us highly recommended as worthy the perusal of every person that wishes to know what the *Bible* teaches respecting baptism; to all who desire to be guided by the *word of God alone* in reference to this ordinance. This essay would have been more properly denominated Baptist and Paido-baptist, unscriptural guide to unscriptural baptism. If the word of God is the correct standard of appeal in this matter, (and it undoubtedly is) what need has he of his eighty witnesses, to sustain his point. Why is it called a scriptural guide? And why is it recommended to those who desire to be guided by the word of God *alone*? Such an attempt to deceive is almost unparalleled on earth! The testimony of one inspired writer, clear, and full to the point, would do more, in my opinion, toward settling this controversy, than all the testimony of baptists, and concessions of Paido-baptists that have been, or can be arrayed against the word of God. If the reader has derived

his creed from the Bible, he no doubt will agree with me that the Scriptures of eternal truth are the only correct standard of appeal, and that they only, afford testimony that can be relied upon in all matters of religion. If the advocates of the immersion theory should succeed in establishing the point they have labored so long and so hard to establish, namely, that the scriptures do point out, and require one mode of baptism to the exclusion of every other mode; and that that one mode is essentially necessary to constitute a valid christian baptism; they will thereby invalidate their own baptism, and utterly demolish their whole system.

It will be seen from the following pages that if immersion is at all admissible as the mode of baptism, it must be admitted on the principle that the mode is by no means essential to constitute the validity of the ordinance, for it is certain the scriptures recognize no other mode but that of effusion. I would however say, that although I do not believe that the Scriptures authorize baptism by means of immersion, yet I do not believe that an error, merely in reference to the mode, is fatal to the interests of the soul; I believe that a person may be in error upon that point, and yet enjoy communion wi h God on earth, and finally have an abundant entrance into the everlasting king-dom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

In reference to the second part of this work i n

which the doctrine of salvation by grace through faith, is clearly established in opposition to the doctrine of Justification (in the sense of pardon) by baptism, or any other work of righteousness which we can do, I would say I believe that an error upon this point, would prove prejudicial, if not fatal, to our present and future well-being. It may be thought that I have been too severe in some of the remarks which I have made in relation to the views of Alexander Campbell. This, however, will not be thought to be the case by those who are acquainted with the course pursued by him and his party towards those who do not follow his *ipse dixit*, in reference to the mode and design of water baptism.

In many other respects he is quite liberal, but in this, it is well known, that his hand is against every man, if every man's hand is not against him. It is a principle recognized in the word of God, that some shall be dealt with; with a greater degree of severity than others. "Of some have *compassion*, making a difference; and others *save with fear*, pulling them out of the fire."—Jude 22, 23.

Some of his positions and assumptions are too absurd, not to say ridiculous, to require a serious refutation. If then, the reader should find in this Essay, what in his opinion amounts to sarcasm, my only plea is, that such was the absurdity of his pretentions that sober argument was unnecessary. I

trust, however, the reader will find, that wherever there was an argument to be met, it has been met with sound reason and sober argument from the word of God. If there should be any misunderstanding, and this should originate misrepresentation, he and his party should be the last people in the world to complain, lest in condemning others, they condemn themselves also. Should the sequel prove that one article of their faith contradicts another, and that both contradict the word of God, let not the inconsistency be charged upon me because I have pointed it out. That one does contradict another, and both stand opposed to the sacred oracles, is made clearly to appear in many places. Take, for instance, the following declarations of Mr. Campbell: "Immersion *alone* is that act of turning to God." "It is not our faith in God's promise of remission, but our *going down into the water*, that obtains the remission of sins." Now, as these are separate and distinct acts, and on his own principle going into the water always precedes immersion, then if going down into the water obtains remission, we might go out of the water without being immersed, and consequently obtain the remission of sins without immersion, which is his method of turning to God. It is I trust not only shown that these statements contradict one another, but that they equally oppose the testimony of

all the inspired writers of the Old and New Testament.

From those whose sentiments I have opposed in this part of the work, I expect no mercy. And from the course hitherto pursued by some of them towards all their opponents, and toward me in particular, I expect to be dealt with most rigorously. I would just say, that all the favor I ask is, that they will with care, and without prejudice, examine the whole work, compare it with the word of God, and then point out my errors, as clearly as I have pointed out theirs.

It will be seen that in this Essay I have attacked their strong-holds, that I have carefully examined those passages of Scripture upon which they rely for the support of their system; and have shown that those Scriptures so far from supporting their sentiment, when rightly interpreted, are utterly opposed, to it. Their strongest positions I have not evaded but have met them with sound argument drawn from the word of God. I trust the intelligent reader will see that if the word of God may be relied upon as truth, the system opposed in this work, is a dangerous heresy, and a gross absurdity.

If all their arguments in favor of baptismal regeneration have not been met, I here pledge myself, if life and health are spared, to meet them as soon as they shall be made known. Truth has nothing

to fear from investigation. I hope this work will be carefully and critically examined; its errors detected; its truths embraced; and may God grant that we may know the truth, and that the truth may make us free, that in the day of judgment both the writer and the readers may render their account with joy and not with grief.

MODE OF BAPTISM.

From the limited extent of human knowledge, and the different points of view in which the same subjects may be contemplated by different minds, it follows of necessity that people differ in their opinions in regard to many things. In reference to the mode of baptism it is well known that much has been written and much said by way of controversy; some contending that immersion is so essential to the Christian baptism, that any, and every person that has not been immersed, however pious and godly his life may be in every other respect, must be excluded from what they call the table of the Lord. To all such they do virtually say: "Stand by thyself, I am holier than thou." There are others, possessing a less degree of charity, (or rather none at all,) who would have every unimmersed person excluded from the kingdom of God. And surely if they consider the mode of baptism of such vital importance, they would not think it right for me, or any other individual, to follow the ipse dixit of any man, or set of men; but to examine the subject according to our ability and opportunity, as each will have to render

an account of himself to God. That baptism as a Christian duty is enjoined upon Christians under ordinary circumstances, few, we think, would deny; but that immersion is essential to constitute a valid Christian baptism, is doubted by many. One party affirms; the other denies. And while one contends that nothing less than immersion, or an entire plunging under water is baptism; the other contends that a person may be truly and scripturally baptized by effusion. In this controversy our only appeal should be to the Scriptures. And here, at the outset, I would say, that those who contend that immersion only, is baptism, to sustain their position, must do it, first, by the meaning of the word, or words used to denote the ordinance; or, secondly, by an express command; or, thirdly, by such circumstances as would show the utter impossibility of its having been administered in any other way. Should it be thought that it could be done by example, I should say it might, if there was proof that any one was baptized expressly for an example, and that example was known to be immersion. But it is denied that any one ever was baptized for an example, or that immersion was ever practised by John the Baptist, or any of the Apostles. But it may be asked, "can we not prove several cases of immersion?" We answer yes! Immersion can be proved by refering to Noah's flood, or the overwhelming of the Egyp-

tians in the red sea; but these were not cases of baptism; nor do we think that any one can be found who would like to be immersed under similar circumstances.

We again say, if immersion is sustained at all; it must be done by the meaning of the word, by an express command, or by attending circumstances. In order to prove the mode of baptism by the meaning of the word, such a word must be used to denote the ordinance as has invariably one meaning. And here I would remark that words are properly divided into three classes: univocal, equivocal, and synonymous. Univocal words are always used in the same sense, and can be used in no other; such as genus, electricity, individuality. Equivocal words are such as are employed in different senses, as head board, post, &c. Words are synonymous when they both may with propriety be applied to the same thing as wave and billow, dwelling and habitation, &c. If we turn our attention to the word head, we find that it may mean part of a nail, or of an animal, one of the divisions of a discourse, or the leader of a party,—Board, is used to signify a flat piece of wood a table, deck of a ship, a council, food,—Post, a messenger, a station, office, a piece of timber. Equivocal words, do not of themselves convey any definite meaning For instance we find on a piece of paper the word head; there being no other words used in

connection with it, we are utterly at a loss to ascertain its meaning. But let a person tell us when attempting to drive a nail he missed the head, it would not be difficult to understand him. Let a preacher say he would divide his subject into two, three, or four heads, we should understand him to mean so many divisions of his discourse. So the word board, when used in relation to different circumstances has its different meanings; it is equally true in regard to all equivocal words, they have no definite meaning of themselves, and their meaning can be ascertained only by the relation which they sustain to other words, and by attending circumstances. Having proceeded thus far, and having fully established these important premises without the least fear of successful contradiction; I shall make that use of them that I may deem proper in the investigation of the subject before us. We now enquire to which of these classes of words, the word baptism belongs. If it is an equivocal word and not confined to one meaning, all must agree that the word itself can never determine the manner of administering the ordinance. But there are those who from a recklessness of consequences or ignorance of language, will contend that baptism is not an equivocal word, that it is always used in the same sense, and that is immersion, or plunging. If this position be correct, if it is always used in the sense of im

mersion or plunging, then we may without doing violence to language or the true meaning of the writers, substitute these terms for baptism in all those passages in which the word occurs. Let us try some of the examples given in the New Testament by this rule. The first to which we refer is found in Matthew iii. 11. "I indeed (baptize) that is immerse or plunge you with water; but he (Christ) shall immerse or plunge you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire." Matthew xx. 22. "Are ye able to be (baptized) immersed or plunged with the immersion or plunging that I am immersed or plunged with."—Acts i. 5, "Ye shall be (baptized) immersed or plunged with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." 1 Corinthians x. 2, "And were all (baptized) immersed or plunged unto Moses in the cloud, and in the sea." Other examples might be given, but these are sufficient to show in what a ridiculous attitude those place themselves who contend that baptism is synonymous with immersion or plunging. Unfortunately for the advocates of the immersion theory we have not only the utter senselessness of the expression immersed with the Holy Ghost, and immersed with fire to set against them, but also the facts recorded by the inspired writers, are directly opposed to their whole system. It is said they were baptized with water, as well as with the Holy Ghost; if therefore the meaning be, ye shall be plunged

into the water, it also means ye shall be plunged into the Holy Ghost; but if the Holy Ghost was poured upon them when baptized with it, then it is absolutely certain that the water with which a person is baptized should be poured upon the person; unless the same word is used in different senses in the same sentence, which we think will not be contended for by our opponents. Should there be any person so destitute of common sense and common honesty as to say that the expression "baptized with water, and baptized with the Holy Ghost," means that although when you are baptized with the Spirit, it shall be poured upon you; but when baptized with water it shall not be poured upon you, but you must be immersed, or plunged into it; we deny the assertion, and demand proof. We therefore take the ground that "baptize with water" gives evidence that the water was applied to the person baptized, and when John says, Matth. iii. 11, and our Saviour Acts i. 5, "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost;" they both mean the Holy Ghost shall be poured upon you. Let a man be employed to paint a house; one side he was to paint with red paint, and the rest with yellow; would he for a moment hesitate in regard to the manner of doing it? would he conclude that because the materials with which he painted were different, that the manner of painting must therefore be different? would he not be thought beside him-

self if he should contend that although it was correct to apply the paint to the house on one side, yet the other could not be painted without immersing it?—Apply this to the case before us; John says, "I baptize you with water but he (Christ) shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." The Scriptures make use of the following language in reference to the gift of the Spirit. "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; And it shall come to pass in the last days saith God, I will pour out of my spirit upon all flesh," &c. Acts ii. 16, 17. In the 33d verse, Peter says "having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear." Acts x. 44, 45, "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision, which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost." Acts xi. 15, 16., "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning: Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said; John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." Query; Did the pouring out of the Holy Ghost cause Peter to remember immersion; or did it call to his remembrance, the fact that John baptized by pouring?—The word baptism then, so far from favoring the idea

of immersion, as used in the New Testament, proves the contrary to be its meaning. But lest it should be thought that these are all the passages in which the term is used in opposition to immersion, we will give a few more examples. Luke xi: 38, "And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he (Christ) had not first washed, (in the Greek, *ebaptisthe*, baptized,) before dinner;" will any person who is not biased by a preconceived opinion believe that the word baptism is here used in the sense of an entire immersion or plunging; for in that case he must have been plunged naked; changed his raiment, or sat at the table dripping wet. For my own part I can believe neither without better evidence than I am at present in possession of. Another case in point is found in Mark vii: 4: "And when they come from the market, except they wash (*Baptizontia*, baptize) they eat not." Adam Clarke in commenting upon this passage, says it may mean either to wash or to dip; giving us to understand however, that ten versions, viz: Codex Vaticanus, eight others, and Euthymius, have the word (rantisontia) sprinkle. It is therefore certain in this case, unless they plunged themselves, as before stated, that the word is used in a different sense from immersion. And many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the washing, (*Baptismous*, baptisms,) of cups and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables. Adam Clarke re-

marks upon this passage: "As the (*Baptismous*, baptisms,) is applied to all these; and as it is contended, that this word and the verb whence it is derived, signify dipping or immersion alone, its use in the above cases refutes that opinion: and shows that it was used, not only to express dipping or immersion, but also sprinkling and washing." The same author in his note on Matth. iii: 6, enquires, "were the people dipped or sprinkled, for it is certain that Bapto and Baptizo mean both." He again says, "To say that sprinkling or aspersion is not gospel baptism, is as incorrect as to say that immersion is none." We should not have made these quotations had it not been asserted that A. Clarke, as well as all other critics of eminence had conceded the point that baptism signifies immersion only. Alexander Campbell in his debate with McCalla, page 167, says: "All Protestant and Catholic critics of eminence concede this point, that immersion is the meaning of baptism, and that it does not signify sprinkling or pouring." Then he adds: "Our first argument in proof of the position that immersion is the only baptism is, that the word baptism, a Greek word, literally signifies immersion only, or what is equivalent to it, dipping or submerging under water." As he, with all others who make such an assertion found their argument upon what we know to be false, their argument necessarily falls to the ground. Without conceding any thing in fa-

vor of immersion, we may say that all critics and lexicographers agree that immersion is one meaning of the term; with the same degree of confidence however, we can say that not one of them will assert, (unless entirely under the influence of sectarian bigotry,) that that, is its only meaning. We have already made quotations from Clarke to show that the assertion is untrue, that all the learned agree that immersion is the only meaning of the word baptism. We would ask the reader to examine Grove's Lexicon, Calmet's Dictionary, Parkhurst and Ainsworth, and also Ewing's Greek and English Lexicon, with others; and then judge whether the learned do not say that sprinkling, or pouring, is one meaning of the word as well as immersion. Wesley has frequently been quoted as favoring the idea of immersion: nothing however, is more unfair. It is true, in the early part of his life; when in all probability he had not paid much attention to that subject, he seemed to favor immersion as a proper mode, not because the Scriptures favored that view, but in obedience to the rubrick of the church of England; yet it is well known to those who are not willingly ignorant, that after examining the subject thoroughly he favored the idea of sprinkling, or pouring, more than that of immersion. In his treatise on baptism, doctrinal tracts, page 253, he says, "baptism is performed by washing, dipping, or sprinkling the person, in the

name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who is hereby devoted to the ever blessed Trinity. I say by washing, dipping, or sprinkling: because it is not determined in Scripture, in which of these ways it shall be done, neither by express precept, nor by any such example as clearly proves it; nor by the force and meaning of the word baptize." He also says, on the same page, that "it cannot be certainly proved from Scripture, (and we think no one will contend that it can be uncertainly proved) that even John's (baptism) was performed by dipping."—"Nor can it be proved that the baptism of our Savior, or that administered by his disciples was by immersion. No, nor that of the eunuch baptized by Philip;" and on the 250th page, he says, "to sum up all, the manner of baptizing (whether by dipping or sprinkling) is not determined in Scripture. Thre is no command for one rather than the other. There is no example from which we can conclude for dipping, rather than sprinkling. There are probable examples of *both;* and both are equally contained in the natural meaning of the word." Observe, he says both are *equally* contained in the natural meaning of the word. We have not given the opinion of these men as proof of the point at issue; but to show the unfairness of those who quote them as sustaining immersion only, as the mode of baptism. It is frequently the case that the concessions of Pædo-baptists are much relied upon to sus-

tain the immersion theory. I do not know but some immersionists depend *more* upon such concessions than upon the sacred oracles; and well they may, for undoubtedly they are very often more in their favor than the word of God will warrant. I do not believe however, that they are quoted fairly when referred to in proof that immersion is the only baptism. We would say, however, that if any one of those who practise sprinkling, or pouring for baptism, should at the same time acknowledge that immersion is the only meaning of the word baptize; that his statement could not be relied upon inasmuch as his practice contradicts his profession, and he thereby gives evidence that he is morally dishonest. I am far from believing this to be the case; and think the dishonesty is on the part of those who quote them to sustain that sentiment. We admit that many, if not the most of them do agree that dipping is one meaning of the word, not conceding however, that it does not mean sprinkle or pour. It is frequently urged as a very convincing argument, that while those who practise effusion confess that immersion also may be baptism, the immersionist on the other hand is so confident that he is right, and that every one who does not agree with him is wrong, he will make no such concession; but pronounces every person unbaptized who has not been immersed. I must confess my inability to feel the force of this argument, while

there are so many anxious pull the mote out of their brother's eye, and regard not the beam in their own. Nor can I consider a man's confidence, evidence of the correctness of his opinion, while it is written, "the fool rageth and is confident." All we have to do with those who concede the point that immersion is the only baptism, and those who would sustain it by argument; is to prove that their views of that subject are unscriptural, and that they both are in error on that point. But why do the advocates of immersion depend so much upon such concessions? Is it not because error has more influence upon their minds than truth? Hear what their champion says in relation to this matter: "Such monstrous errors, and misrepresentations of Paedo-Baptist writers, contributed much to making me a Baptist." *These*, gentle reader, are the words of Alexander Campbell. Debate with McCalla, page 105. And as misrepresentation and error, have had much influence in making them Baptists, they seem determined to walk by the same rule, and mind the same things. And yet those who are guilty of such "monstrous errors and misrepresentations," as they say, are the very persons whose testimony they rely upon to aid them in sustaining the immersion theory; so that whenever they speak or write upon the subject of baptism, these individuals must be brought forward as the best of witnesses in the case. A. Campbell, in his debate with McCalla, page 277, says, "As we

always prefer, when it is practicable, to refute the glosses of Paedo-baptists by Paedo-baptists themselves, we shall transcribe McKnight's notes on this passage." Yes, it is quite preferable in his opinion!—But why does he prefer it to plain scriptural facts? For this plain reason, the scriptural facts are against him. For my own part I cannot conceive how theological truth can be better sustained, than by an appeal to the sacred oracles. Let those explain this matter, who prefer confuting one error with another. We must close our remarks on the first proposition of this subject, after giving one or two more quotations from the word of God to sustain the position that immersion is not the only meaning of baptism. In the book of Daniel, ch. iv, v. 33, we read "his body was wet with the dew of heaven, till his hairs were grown like eagles feathers, and his nails like birds claws." The word translated wet, is (*ebaphe*) from *bapto*. Here was a baptism with dew; will any one contend that this was an immersion in dew? If so, let him recollect it was not an immersion for a moment only, for he was baptized till his hairs were grown like eagles feathers, and his nails like birds claws. If this was a case of baptism by the descent of the dew, then the point is sustained that baptism is by effusion. If immersion is meant then the dew was collected in such a quantity as to admit of a literal burial, or immersion in it, which we think no one in his senses

will contend for. If any one can believe this, he is capable of believing any thing he may wish to believe. But his faith must go still farther; he must believe he remained literally immersed, or buried in the dew, until his nails were grown like birds claws. The absurdity of such a belief must be obvious to all; yet nothing less than this can be meant, if immersion is the only mode of baptism. It is therefore clear that baptism is administered by effusion.. Alexander Campbell says, in his debate with McCalla, page 303, speaking of Nebuchadnezzar's baptism: "He slept upon the dewy grass, and was so completely moistened, as though immersed in water. He was in the dew, overwhelmed with it as a person in a river." Now I think, whatever may be his opinion of this matter, that if a person should sleep during one night in a river, overwhelmed in it, or with it, that it would be very strange if he should be living in the morning. But according to his views he could do it night after night, until his nails were grown like birds claws, and life not become extinct. What will he not believe and say, rather than admit (what was certainly the truth) that he was baptized by effusion, or the descent of the dew upon his body, and consequently that the Scripture recongizes aspersion as the mode of baptism. Revelation xix: 13 "And he was clothed in with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called the Word of God." *BeBemmanon aimati*, that

is, baptized or stained with blood. That baptism does not in this place signify plunging, is clear from two considerations: first, Christ is represented as a successful warrior, going forth upon a horse to smite the nations, it would scarcely be correct to suppose that the slain in battle were literally immersed in blood, much less that a conqueror should be buried in the blood of his enemies. His garment could only be stained or sprinkled with the blood which proceeded from the wounds of those who fell in battle. Secondly, the prophecy of Isaiah, ch. lxiii: v. 1st and 4th inclusive, settles the matter without doubt. The circumstances mentioned by the prophet show most conclusively that he intended to set forth the same facts recorded Revelation xix. The prophet enquires,—"Who is this that cometh from Edom with dyed garments from Bozrah? this that is glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength? I that speak in righteousness mighty to save. Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the wine fat? I have trodden the wine press alone, and of the people there was none with me, for I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury; and their blood shall be *sprinkled* upon my garment, and I will stain all my raiment. For the day of vengeance is in my heart, and the year of my redeemed is come." I do not see how any person can read this prophecy, and

the facts recorded in the history of the fulfillment, and still contend that baptism is not performed by sprinkling. Should it be said that the prophet does not agree with the revelator, because the prophet says he had trodden the wine press alone, and of the people there was none with him, we reply, it is not said in revelation that the army was *with* him, but only that they *followed* him; nor did they use the sword, or come so near as to have their raiment baptized or sprinkled with the blood. The fact that our translators have rendered baptism in this place dip does not at all affect the case, or prove that it was an immersion, any more than the rendering of (*em Baph. as*) baptizeth, dippeth his hand with me in the dish, Matthew ch. xxvi: v. 23, proves that his hand was totally immersed or plunged into the dish, or liquid contained in it. This could only be a partial dipping and not an entire submersion, which must have been the case if baptism means immersion only. We would remark that the German translation has the word rendered sprinkle instead of dip. This is in perfect accordance with the facts prophesied of by Isaiah,—"Their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment." Alex-Campbell in the fourth edition, new version, appendix, page, 48, speaking of Luther's views of baptism says that Luther says "I would have those that are to be baptized, to be wholly dipped into the water, as

the word imports and the mystery does signify." Accordly in his translation he styles John the Baptist, *John the Dipper*, or *John the Immerser*." Here Mr. C. asserts a most glaring untruth, in reference to the Lutheran translation; an untruth, in which he can be detected by any one who can read the German language. It is not so rendered by Luther in any case, which can be easily seen by refering to his translation, and comparing it with a German dictionary.—A profane author, one who understood the Greek language well, viz. Homer, uses the term in the sense of staining or dying when he says a lake was baptized with the blood of a frog. Would it not be a strange performance to dip or immerse a lake in the blood of a frog? Certainly not more so than to contend that to baptize, means only to immerse.

We would now remark that the most zealous advocates for immersion have virtually conceded the point that baptism does not always mean immersion, by giving it other renderings. A. Campbell in his new translation, third edition, has twice, rendered the word wash, twice undergo, and once administer.—Mark vii. 4. Luke xi. 38—Mark x. 39—Acts xix. 4. [See note A.] Notwithstanding all this, he is so reckless of censequences he will still contend that immersion is its only meaning. This, however, is nothing more than we should expect from his former course, for although he may feel himself van-

quished he will not yield; he will hold on to the last though he may feel in his heart that he is defeated. As evidence of the truth of this statement, we would refer the reader to the preface of his debate with M'. Calla, on the 10th page; he there confesses that he remembers to have been vanquished, when arguing with an old lady; he says, "It is true I had something to say, and held on stoutly to the last; but I felt in my own heart that I was defeated; and what mortified me no little was, that with all my philosophy and divinity, an old woman's common sense overpowered me."

Here is the most conclusive evidence of moral dishonesty, an unwillingness to yield to the force of argument, even when he felt in his own heart that he was defeated. And yet, gentle reader, this is the man who accuses almost the whole Pædo-baptist world with dishonesty. And this charge of dishonesty, he prefers against them because they did not translate the Greek word Baptizo, immersion. But why did they not? Certainly because they did not believe that to be its meaning. It would undoubtedly be correct to translate it immersion, if the words were synonymous, but this is not the case; if these words were of the same import, every baptism must not only be an immersion, but every immersion must be baptism. Who does not see the absurdity of the opinion that everything that has been immersed has

been baptized? And this is not all; every time they are immersed they are baptized. Some persons then, must have been baptized a thousand times; and yet the apostle Paul has the temerity to say, we have "one baptism." We see then, that these words are not used in the same sense. The Egyptians were immersed, but were not baptized. The Israelites were baptized, but were not immersed. Indeed the word immersion, only signifies to put under water; and never means to take out, so that if immersion were necessary to the performance of the act of baptism, still, it would require another word, that is, emersion to take them out again. We see therefore, that immersion only, would result in the drowning of every person that was thus plunged under water, for if that only, be done, they must remain under water till the resurrection of the dead. How absurd then, the notion that immersion only, is baptism. It is well known that our baptist friends will not admit that any thing less than a total immersion is baptism. But upon this principle they condemn their own practice; for they do not immerse the whole person. They allow the candidate for baptism to walk into the water until nearly one third of the person is under water. Now it is certain that they cannot put that part of the person under, which is already under, and therefore do not immerse the whole person!—It may be said that though they do not put the

whole person under water, yet the circumstance of *being under*, constitutes baptism. But on this principle, I ask, would not nearly one third, or one half of the *Minister* be baptized at the same time? And if the mere circumstance of being under water constitutes baptism, a person might baptize himself. For he has most certainly as good a right to baptize the whole, as any part of himself. On the principle that it requires a total immersion to constitute baptism, the minister should take the person from a place where there is no water, and plunge him entirely under water! Have they ever done this? If not, either this view is wrong, or they are unbaptized. We would further say, that we do not believe that every sprinkling, or pouring, is baptism, though the scriptures teach that baptism is performed in that way; yet we should be unwilling to have the term translated by these words, because this is only the *means*, or *mode* by which it is done. There is not a word in the English language, which conveys the whole meaning of the word baptize. Nor did the Latin, or French translators find a word in those languages by which they could properly translate it. They, therefore, as well as the English, have *adopted* the Greek word, only giving it such a termination as agreed with the idiom of their language. In the German, it is *translated;* but they do not have *Tauchen*, to dip, but *Taufen*, to baptize, which word

can be used with the strictest propriety when aspersion is the mode.

We believe baptism has not in any case been rendered by a word corresponding to immerse, except by some Desperado, who was determined at all hazards to sustain an unsound theory. A great ado has been made by certain individuals because the word was adopted, instead of being translated. We would inform those who need information in this matter, that this is not the *only* word adopted from the Greek, but a vast number of our theological words, are borrowed from that language; and yet as far as I know, there is general satisfaction, except in this one instance. And we believe all would be satisfied in this case, did they not feel the difficulty of sustaining the immersion theory, by the common version of the Scriptures. In all those words adopted from the original Scriptures, it is certain the sense is not altered; but just as sure as man is fallable, and liable to err, so sure the sense may be altered by translating. If, therefore, there is an error, it must be on the part of those who have translated the word; and not on the part of those who have adopted it. But if they will translate it in the English Scriptures; why call it immersion? Is not this as much a Latin word, as baptism is Greek? Most certainly! What folly then to contend for such a translation; especially as we have shown most con-

clusively that this is not the sense in which it is used in the Scriptures. How absurd the idea of immersing, dipping, or plunging in the Holy Ghost, and in fire!—And yet however much this would contradict not only common sense, but the word of God also, there are those who strenuously contend for this translation; and finding that the cloven tongues like as of fire only sat upon them on the day of pentecost, according to the prophecy of Malachi, "he is like a refiner's fire, and like fuller's soap: and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver, and he shall purify the sons of Levi," they will deny that this was the baptism of fire, and tell us that John meant that they should be baptized in hell fire. This would do very well for those who believe in purgatory; but for protestants, it only serves to show the weakness of the cause they would endeavor to sustain by such a hypothesis. Immersed, or dipped into hell fire indeed! This would not be so dreadful after all, if they only plunged them in, and took them out as soon as possible; as they do in a case of immersion in water. This baptism in hell fire would never have been invented, but for the purpose of sustaining a sinking cause. Nor would they imagine that Nebuchadnezzar was immersed in dew; or the children of Israel were immersed on dry ground; or that Christ had his garments immersed in the blood of his enemies, or that the Pharisee

marveled that Christ did not immerse himself before dinner. Nor would they ever suppose that a burial into death was water baptism, or that the pouring out of the Holy Ghost was an immersion; had they not known that if they did not admit all these absurdities, with many others, they would be constrained to yield themselves vanquished. We have, then, clear proof that Nebuchadnezzar was baptized by the descent of the dew, that the children of Israel were baptized while on dry ground, that Christ's garment was baptized by the sprinkling of blood upon it; that the Pharisees were in the habit of baptizing themselves before dinner; that the disciples were baptized with the Holy Ghost. And after having examined the testimony in all these cases, we are bold to affirm that not one of these baptisms, was an immersion; and with the same confidence we would say that there are many cases of immersion recorded, such as the immersion of the ungodly by the flood, the immersion of the Egyptians in the sea; the immersion of the swine into which the devils entered; and yet not one of these immersions is in Scripture called baptism. It is therefore clear that in those cases immersion is not baptism, nor is baptism, immersion.—These facts are confirmed by 1st John. v: 8, "there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, the water, and the blood; and these three agree in one." Every bible reader knows that the Spirit is poured

upon the person baptized with it; and if he will turn to Heb. xii: 24, and 1st Pet. i: 2, he may learn that the blood of Christ is applied by sprinkling. If, therefore, the water is to agree with these in its application to the person baptized, immersion cannot be the Scriptural mode of administering baptism. We do not however, contend that the manner of applying the water constitutes the validity of the ordinance.—We believe that had the Saviour designed to establish immersion to the exclusion of any other mode; it could, and would have been done.

Had *Bano* or *Dupto*, been chosen to denote the ordinance of baptism, there would have been no controversy in reference to the mode: immersion would undoubtedly be the mode of administering it; but as he chose to employ those words which may be, and so frequently *are* in Scripture used to signify sprinkling, or pouring, the conclusion is irresistible that he did not intend to establish immersion as that mode by the use of those words. We said at the commencement of our subject, that those who contend for immersion as the only mode of baptism, in order to sustain their position, must prove it either by the meaning of the word, by an express command to be immersed, or by such circumstances as would necessarily exclude every other mode. We have examined the first position, have found the word an equivocal one, that it has various meanings, that it is in

Scripture used in the sense of sprinkling or pouring; and consequently that there is a complete failure on the part of our opponents to sustain their theory by the use and meaning of that word. We now attend to the second position, that is, in relation to the *command* for immersion. And we have here little more to do than to ask, where is this command found?—Where is the chapter and verse which declares that we shall be *immersed*, *dipped*, *plunged*, or *buried* in water or in the Holy Ghost? All is silent! Nor can we even find the expression baptized *in* water, or *in* the Holy Ghost; yet we can find many passages which speak of *pouring* water, *sprinkling* water upon them, sprinkling *with* water, baptizing *with* water, baptizing *with* the Holy Ghost. Here then, we see the whole force of the argument lies against the immersion system, as well in this as in regard to the meaning of the word as used in Scripture. It is therefore clear to every unprejudiced mind that immersion as the only mode of baptism cannot be sustained, either by the meaning of the word, or by an express command.

JOHN'S BAPTISM IN JORDAN.

We are now prepared to attend to the circumstances under which the ordinance was administered. And if, in this examination, evidence is found in favor of immersion, we will frankly acknowledge it; but we wish to be distinctly understood, that with us assertion without proof is of no avail, while the testimony of the inspired writers will in no case be rejected.

The first account of baptism, recorded in the New Testament, is found in the third chapter of Matthew, in which it is said, John baptized in Jordan. This has been thought by some, to afford evidence of immersion; but we ask in what does this evidence consist? Not in the word baptism, for we have shown that in the sense in which it is used in Scripture, it is entirely against that view. Not in the preposition, *in;* because they might be in Jordan, without being in the water at all. The term Jordan, may have been used in reference to the channel, or bed of the river, rather than in regard to the stream or the waters of the Jordan. But supposing they were in the waters, (which cannot be proved) where is the evidence of immersion in that

case? Does the expression *in water*, prove anything in regard to depth? Should it be said that a person *washed in water*, *in* a river, *in* a lake, *in* a brook, or *in* a bowl. What evidence would there be of immersion in that case; or that he was in the water ankle deep? Let a child put his hand in water, which has been spilled upon the floor, and it is not an uncommon occurrence for the mother to say, the child is in the water, take the child out of the water; without designing to be understood that the child was immersed. The passage now under consideration, so far from proving immersion, does not give evidence that they were in the waters of the Jordan. The Greek *en*, which is here rendered *in*, is translated *at*, in one hundred places in the New Testament; and *with*, in a hundred and fifty others. We will give one or two examples in which the same word is rendered *at*. "The disciple who leaned on Jesus's bosom (*en*) at supper." John xxi. 20. Jesus is set down (*en*) at the right hand of the throne of God. Heb. xii. 2. The translation in these passages is undoubtedly correct; it would not make good sense to read, he leaned on Jesus' bosom in supper; and is set down in the right hand of the throne; the phrase in Jordan, might, therefore with propriety, be rendered *at* Jordan; indeed it is almost certain that it should be so rendered; for we read, John i. 28, "These things were done in Bethabara

beyond Jordan where John was baptizing." John x. 40, "And Jesus went away again beyond Jordan, into the place where John at first baptized and there he abode." If, according to these declarations, John baptized beyond Jordan; it could not be in it, (unless they could be in it, and beyond it at the same time,) neither could Christ abide in the place where John baptized, without abiding in Jordan. There are four things in reference to John's baptism, which must be proved, before our opponents can claim it to favor their views. 1. That the preposition *en*, in the Greek, is properly rendered *in*, in this place. 2. That in the *Jordan*, means in the *waters* of Jordan. 3. That in the *water*, means that there was a sufficient depth of water where they were for immersion, and 4. That they actually were immersed; and not baptized by effusion. All these must be proved, before it can be made appear that John's baptism was immersion: and yet we believe they would fail to sustain any one of them. But suppose we admit the first, for the sake of argument; let them meet us at the second point; let them attempt to prove that in the Jordan means in the waters of Jordan; we read in other parts of the Scripture, that people were in the sea, and in the Jordan, when it is absolutely certain they were not in the water. It is said that Jesus entered into a vessel and sat in the sea. Mark iv. 1. That the children of Israel went into the midst

of the sea. Yet the sacred historian informs us that it was on dry ground. Exodus xiv. 22. There is most conclusive evidence that in Jordan does not always mean in the waters of Jordan, in Joshua iii. 8. "When ye are come to the brink of the water of Jordan, ye shall stand still in Jordan." Here it is clear that *in Jordan*, only means *to the brink* of the water of Jordan, and not in the water at all. In the 13th verse we have evidence that they were in the waters of Jordan. (they had gone a step further) and yet only the soles of their feet were in it. In the 17th verse we learn that they were in the midst of Jordan and yet upon dry ground. Should it be said that this was a miraculous occurrence; we reply it would be a greater miracle still, to preserve the life of John if he baptized, by immersion, the multitudes that came to him. We also say that the circumstance recorded, Joshua iii. 8, where it is said they should *stand still in Jordan*, when they were not in the water, but only to the brink of it; had nothing miraculous in it; this took place before the miracle was wrought, before the waters were divided. From this, and other cases of like nature, we see it impossible even to prove that they were in the water; and there yet remains three other points to be proved. And as not one of these four things can be proved, the argument in favor of immersion, necessarily falls to the ground. But it may be said that the expres-

sion went up straightway out of the water, Matthew iii. 16, is proof of the correctness of their system. Now give this expression all the force that truth and justice will possibly admit of; then give it as much more; and after all, it must entirely fail of proving immersion. How frequently do people go in, and out of water, without being dipped or immersed; recollect it is not said, he was taken out, which is always the case when baptized by immersion; but as it is: it only refers to an act of his own, and not an act of the administrator. / Cannot a person come up out of the water without having been under it? Did not the children of Israel come up out of the sea without being under water? In the 4th chapter of Joshua xvi. 17, 18, verses, the expression come up out of Jordan occurs three times, in the 19th; it is expressly said the people came up out of Jordan; yet it is unequivocally declared they passed over the Jordan on dry ground. / What folly it is, then, to contend that in this case there is any evidence of immersion. This matter might rest here, with perfect safety to our cause; but as it is our duty to make the subject as plain as possible, we will take another view of it: the Greek preposition that is here rendered *out of* is *apo*, the first, or primary meaning of which is *from;* this word occurs in Matth. 84 times; 9 times only, it is rendered *out of*, 75 times by some other word, most of which is *from.* According to

Groves' Lexicon the word has 18 different meanings. the first is *from*; the 12th, is *out of*. Had our translators given it the first, instead of the 12th meaning, it would read went up *from* the water. In the 7th verse of the same chapter it is rendered *from*. "Who hath warned you to flee (*apo*) *from* the wrath to come," this is undoubtedly a correct translation; it would not be correct either in sense or in fact to read it *out of* the wrath to come, for they were not *in* it; but as it was coming they might flee *from* it. *From*, would also better agree with the fact, recorded.—Matth. iii. 13, "Then cometh Jesus (*apo*) from Galilee to Jordan, unto John to be baptized *of* him." Observe it is said; *to* Jordan to be baptized *of* John; not *into* Jordan to be *immersed*, *dipped*, or *plunged* by him.

JOHN'S BAPTISM IN AENON.

The much water in Ænon is also relied upon to sustain the practice of immersion. This, however, is a mere quibble. It must be admitted by every person of learning, if there is not a want of candor, that the literal rendering of this passage, is many waters, and not much waters. The Greek word *Polla*, has been adopted in the English language and still retains its former signification; thus, Polyglot, containing many languages; not much languages. Polysyllable, a word of many syllables, not much syllables. Mr. Robinson, a baptist historian, makes the following singular remark in reference to the Greek word *Polla*: "How it comes to pass that a mode of speaking, which on every other occasion signifies *much*, in the case of baptism means *little*, is a question easy to answer."—(History of Baptism, page 27.) Here is a broad insinuation that there is on our part, a departure from the primary meaning of the word, for the purpose of sustaining our peculiar views! But what are the facts of the case? Is it true that this mode of speaking does in *every other* case signify *much*? For a correct view of the meaning of the word, we refer the reader to the following

passages: Matth. xiii, 3, "And he spake (*polla*) many things unto them in parables." Matth. xvi: 21, "Suffer (*polla*) many things." Mark i: 3, 4, "Cast out (*polla*) many devils." Mark vi: 20, "did (*polla*) many things." John viii: 26, "I have (*polla*) many things to say." John x: 32, (*Polla*) "Many good works have I showed you (*ek*) from my Father."—Acts ii: 43, "And (*polla*) many wonders and signs were done by the Apostles." James iii: 2, "In (*polla*) many things we offend all." 2 John i: 12, "Having (*polla*) many things to write." It will be seen by every intelligent person that *much* would not be a correct translation in these and many other texts which might be referred to, and further it will be seen by reference to Lexicons that *many* and not *much* is the primary sense of that word. But as this is the only passage in which the term occurs in relation to a case of baptism, it is easily seen why the advocates of baptism by immersion should be so desirous to depart from the primary sense of the word! But the immersionist cannot see why they would want either much or many waters, except for immersion. We would say that the waters of a well or a spring would not satisfy the wants of the multitudes that attended the ministry of John; hence the propriety of selecting a place where there were many waters or many springs. We find it necessary when we hold campmeetings, (though they last but a few

days,) to go where there is more water than a common spring or well would afford, though we use but little for baptism; and even if we baptized all, by dipping them, it would require much more for other purposes, than for baptism. There can be no doubt but it would require more water to supply the wants of five thousand people for a month, or even a week, than to immerse them half a dozen times. If this still is urged in favor of immersion, we have another thought to present, which is, that the word here used, whether it signify many or much, is but a word of comparison; one man may be said to have many horses, another to have but few sheep, yet the few sheep may exceed in number the many horses. In this expression we only mean that one has more horses than common, and the other not so many sheep, as others have. Again we may say one man has much gold, and that another has but little grain, and not be understood that the quantity of gold exceeded the quantity of grain. That little in one case, exceeds much in another, can be true only when different things are referred to, must be evident to all. This brings us to the point at issue. John's baptising in Ænon because there was much water, is spoken of by way of contrast with the baptism administered by the disciples of Christ in the land of Judea. Their baptism then, being contrasted, or put in opposition to each other, if the much water in one

case proves that there was a sufficient quantity for immersion, and, therefore, that John immersed; it proves with equal clearness and force; that there was not water enough for immersion where the disciples baptized, and therefore, that they did not immerse. That their baptism, and the place of baptizing are put in opposition to each other, is obvious. We read John iii. 22, 23, "After these things, came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea, (not into the waters of Judea) and there he tarried with them and baptized. And John also was baptizing in Ænon, near to Salim, because there was much water there; and they came and were baptized." The whole matter is now clear; John had a reason for going where there was much water, which Christ and his disciples had not. It could not be merely for the purpose of baptizing, for in that case the disciples would have had the same reason for going where there was much water, which we never hear of their doing in any one instance for baptism. It could not be in consequence of their baptizing a smaller number, for it was soon said they baptized more than John. That they had not the same reason for going to Jordan and Ænon, that John had; is argued from the fact that it is no where said that they went to Jordan, to Ænon, or to a place of much water for the purpose of baptizing any person. The matter then stands thus: If John baptized the people

of Judea, and Jerusalem, in Jordan, and Ænon, because there was not water enough to immerse in those places; then it must be conceded that the disciples baptized with less water, and consequently in a different manner. Thus it is seen the stronger the argument is, in favor of immersion in one case, the more forcibly it proves baptism by effusion in the other. Thus the immersionist overthrows his own system by the means he employs to establish it. We will now give the true reason why John baptized in places where the Apostles had no occasion to go during their whole ministry. John was a local Preacher, we have no account of his exercising his ministry and preaching in the towns and in private houses; he did not go to the people, but the people to him, and as he protracted his meetings for weeks, and perhaps months, there was an absolute necessity in that case for going where there was water sufficient to supply the wants of the people. The disciples of Christ, and the Apostles were itinerant ministers, they went into the cities and villages, and even into dwelling houses; to preach the gospel.

And notwithstanding they traveled throughout the whole country, and baptized more than John; there is not a shadow of proof that any one of the apostles ever had the least difficulty about finding water for baptizing. Nor do we ever read of their going to a river, pond, or lake, or that they ever

made troughs or baptisteries, built dams, or cut holes in the ice for baptizing; as is frequently the case with those who practise immersion in modern times, should there still be a doubt remaining in regard to the reason for which John went to Jordan, and Ænon; John himself has given us the evidence that it was not for immersion; by saying, I baptize you *with* water; but Christ shall baptize you *with* the Holy Ghost. We have the clearest testimony that when they were baptized with the Holy Ghost it was poured upon them; so that unless he used the word twice in the same sentence conveying two entire different meanings, he has settled forever the manner of applying the water, in the ordinance of baptism and given a death blow to the immersion theory; so far at least, as relates to the administration of that ordinance by himself.

A singular circumstance occurred in the year 1841, which may give light upon the subject of *much water*. There was a debate on the subject of baptism in contemplation; and Newcastle in Coshocton County, Ohio, being named as the place of holding the discussion, an objection arose in consequence of the scarcity of water, and Bladensburg, Knox Co., O., was named as a more suitable place, because there was more water, or, in fact *much water!* But who in his right mind would imagine that the water was wanted for the purpose of debating? The facts

of the case were, that the much water at Bladensburg was not wanted either for debating or immersing, but to supply the wants of the multitude that came to hear. There was water enough in New Castle to supply the wants of the inhabitants of that village, or to have baptized twice that number. So there was water enough in Judea, and Jerusalem, and wherever the disciples of Christ preached the gospel, to baptize all their converts; consequently we never hear of their leaving a village or house to administer the ordinance; but where there were such multitudes assembled as there were, to hear and see John the baptist, they would certainly need much water! Before immersion can be proved from the circumstance of the much water of Ænon, five things must be made to appear:

1st. That the Greek word *Polla*, is correctly rendered much, and that it would not have been more correct to render it many.

2d. That the word much, means that there was enough for immersion.

3d. That more water would be wanted for baptism than for other purposes to supply the wants of the multitudes that attended John's ministry.

4th. That the water was not used for other purposes than baptism.

5th. That John actually plunged the people in the waters of Ænon.

If it were true that John the Baptist was in the German translation called John the Dipper, as has been asserted, (though without foundation,) still the question might arise whether he dipped the people in the Jordan, or dipped the water out with which he baptized them; will some one be so good as to answer it?

APOSTOLIC BAPTISM—BAPTISM OF THE JAILER.

As it regards the ordinance administered by the Apostles, there is not only a lack of evidence in favor of immersion; but on the contrary, every case of baptism performed by them is much against it; wherever they found proper subjects, there they baptized, without the trouble attendant upon immersion. Had they left the place of preaching to find a sufficient quantity of water for plunging their converts, (which they must have done, if that was the mode,) is it not strange that the Scriptures are entirely silent upon that subject? Yet there is not the least proof that one of the Apostles ever moved one step from the place of preaching, merely for the purpose of baptizing! The baptism of the Philippian jailer is supposed to afford evidence of this. But we are bold to affirm that in this case there is no evidence of moving for that purpose. It is true they did go from one place to another, but in doing so they had other objects in view. When the jailer brought them out of the inner prison, he had not heard a word of baptism, consequently bringing them out, could have no reference to that. After that "they spake unto him the word of the Lord and to all that were in the house,

And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway. And when he had brought them into his house, he sat meat before them and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house." Now let me ask where is the evidence so desirable to the immersionist in this case? Is it in the expression he took them? It is not; for it was the jailer that took the Apostles, and not the Apostles that took the jailer.—Those, however, who are so anxious to find evidence as to find it where there is none, will refer us to the expression, he brought them into his house; this, they suppose, favors the idea of immersion. They ask, why did they go out of the jailer's room if not for baptism? we answer for the purpose of washing their stripes. Certainly they would not have their stripes washed with their clothes on. And if there were females in the house, they would leave that; and go into some other part of the Jail, or building, to wash; and having that matter adjusted, they undoubtedly called the family together and baptized them. He afterward brought them into his house, or dining room; and prepared food for them. And as all this could be done without going from under the same roof, and as the Apostles refused to go out, unless the magistrates would come themselves and take them out; it is evident, (that unless the Apostles had already done what they refused to do,) that they

did not during that whole transaction go entirely out of the prison. That there were more apartments than one is clear from the fact that they were thrust "into the *inner* prison," which could not be, unless there was an *outer* one. That they went from one to another, is manifest; because it is said he brought them *out*, (that is out of the inner prison) and he brought them into his house. That the jailer's house was *in* and formed a *part* of the *prison* is undeniable from the fact that the room in which he slept was so situated that he could see that the prison doors were open when he awoke, and further the history given of their case, leaves them in the jailer's house, and yet they considered themselves *still in the prison*, and refused to go out unless the magistrates themselves were there to take them out! Here then, is no evidence of moving, on the part of the apostles, merely for the purpose of baptizing; and the whole circumstance is entirely opposed to the idea of immersion.

BAPTISM OF CHRIST.

The baptism administered to Christ demands some attention from the consideration that some individuals think he was baptized for an example, and that his baptism favors immersion. I cannot however find evidence that will warrant either of these conclusions. That he was baptized for an example I cannot believe without evidence, for it is nowhere said that he was baptized for an example, nor is it even intimated that such was the fact. Several reasons may be urged against this sentiment. 1st. He was not baptized unto repentance, or with any reference to the remission of sin, because he had no sins to be remitted or of which to repent. 2nd. If Christ was baptized for our example, we should not be baptized in the name of Christ, for no one will believe that he was baptized in his own name. 3d. If his baptism was an example for us, we should not be baptized until 30 years of age, for we presume it will not be contended that we are proper subjects of the same baptism at an earlier period of life than was our Savior. 4th. We shall now assign a reason which in the absence of all other reasons, is sufficient to settle this matter conclusively. It is that which was given by the

Savior himself. We presume it will not be said that he had not a proper understanding of this matter, nor will it be contended that he endeavored to deceive John by assigning any other than the true reason for requesting baptism at his hand.—If example was his object why not say thus it becometh us to set an example? Instead of this, he assigns an entire different reason. "*Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.*" It is said by some, that "the term righteousness here has reference to the law of ceremonies, types, and shadows; and the only sense in which Jesus Christ could fulfil such a law, was to terminate the ceremonies, types and shadows in himself the grand antitype." Here then we are to be understand that he did not fulfil the law in the sense of *obeying it*, but by *terminating* or puting an *end to it*. Now let me say that the term fulfil, has no such meaning in the dictionary, much less in the bible. Fulfil means to accomplish; to perform; to obey. "If ye fulfil the royal law, (says James), ye do well." But I do not understand him to mean that we do well to break, or put an end to the royal law; the law of love. When Paul says "bear one another's burdens and so fulfil the law of Christ," he surely did not mean to break, terminate, or put an end to the law of Christ. If when the Saviour says to John it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness he used the term fulfil in the sense of ter-

minating, then he meant it become us to terminate all righteousness, but neither of us must perform all righteousness. Surely no man in his senses can believe all this! John was as much concerned in performing the righteousness of which the Savior spoke as the Savior himself. At least the Savior makes no distinction. He says, "it becometh *us* (that is you and me John) to fulfil all righteousness." All that righteousness no doubt pertaining to that office to which they had been called. And it would have been a sad beginning surely to have violated the law at the very commencement, by refusing to be consecrated according to its requirement. If Christ intended to set an example of *John's* baptism. Why wait until all the people were baptized.—Luke 3. 21. If baptized, for an example of the *Christian* baptism why not wait until the christian baptism was instituted and be the first baptized? For what purpose could he be baptized if it was not with reference to the ministerial office?

We are now led to enquire what righteousness did the Savior fulfil by his baptism?

We are informed, in reference to Christ, it is written in the volume of the book, "Lo I come to do thy will O God." He also declares that he came not to destroy the law but to fulfil. And he has himself said, that one *jot* or one *tittle* should not pass from the law till ALL was *fulfiled*. Had Jesus and others

commenced their ministry at the age of 15 or 20 years; they would have violated the law which required them to be 30 years of age before they officiated in the temple. Again, had he entered upon his ministry without being baptized, or consecrated, according to the requirement of the law of Moses, the law on his part never would have been fulfilled.— We now have only to consult the law of Moses to discover the design of his baptism, and the mode in which it was administered. We learn from Ex. xxix: 4, what was required: "And Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and shalt wash them with water." The manner in which the Levites were set apart to the ministerial office is clearly defined in Num. viii: 7, "And thus shalt thou do unto them, to cleanse them: sprinkle water of purifying upon them."— Hence we conclude that had Jesus been set apart, or dedicated in any other way than by sprinkling, the law of Moses would have been despised, and he found a transgressor. As it respects the sacrifices offered in the case of the Levites, that was for an atonement and could not apply in the case of Jesus. But the anointing required, Ex. xxix: 7, "Then shalt thou take the anointing oil, and pour it upon his head and anoint him," was fulfilled most conspicuously at the consecration or baptism of Christ. It will be recollected that he was called of God as

was Aaron, consequently called at the same age that others of that order were called, which we learn from Num. iv: 3, to be, "From thirty years old and upward, even until fifty years old." Had he been baptized, or consecrated by immersion and not by sprinkling there would have been a manifest violation of the law. But the anointing which took place immediately after his baptism, as well as the language of the Father, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased," gives evidence that he had fulfilled the law by being sprinkled, instead of transgressing it by being immersed. That he was anointed because he had done right, we learn from Heb. i: 9, "Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; *therefore*, God, *even* thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." If Jesus had been baptized or consecrated by immersion, and not by sprinkling, he would have transgressed the law and given evidence that he loved iniquity and hated righteousness. But he says to John, "It becometh us to fulfil all righteousness," therefore he was anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows, that is above those who held the same office into which he had now been initiated. *They* had been anointed with oil prepared by man for that purpose. *He* with the oil of gladness *above* them, even with the Holy Ghost. Acts x. 37, 38, "That word, I say, ye know, which was published

throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power." Christ has settled the design of his baptism beyond the possibility of a doubt. When he was teaching in the temple and instructing the people, the Chief Priests and Elders, demanded of him his authority for doing these things: that is in plain language, Who made you a *Minister*, and gave you authority to teach in the temple? He was ready to meet them on that ground, by refering them to his baptism. He enquires whether the baptism of John was from heaven or of men. They were silenced; they well know that the baptism administered to Christ by John, gave him a right to officiate in the temple by inducting him into the ministerial office. Had he not been baptized by John, or had he been baptized by immersion, contrary to the requirements of the law, he himself would have been silenced, instead of silencing the objectors. Before we close this subject we will notice an objection urged by some against this view of it. "Priests were washed before the door of the tabernacle." Very well, who will say that Christ was not? Who will say there was no tabernacle where Christ was baptized? We read John i. 28. "These things were done in Bethabara beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing." Tabernacle; is a tent, or place of worship. Was

there none in Bathabara, where John baptized?—Had John no tent or place of worship? "The tabernacle of God is with men" saith the Scripture, and who will say it is not? Who will have the assurance to say that he knows that there was no tabernacle near? Another objection is sometimes made, that is, that Christ was not a Priest until his ascension to heaven. Are we to understand then, that to be a "Priest after the order of Melchisedec," and to be "called of God as was Aaron," is to be called to that office after death? It is true Paul says if he were on earth, he would not be a priest; and why? Because he was appointed to offer himself a ransom. It was necessary, therefore, that he should die for our sins and rise again for our justification. Had he remained on earth, he would not have answered the design of his Priesthood, which was to offer himself. Paul says, Heb. vii. 26, 27, "For such an high Priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily as those high Priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for this he did once when he offered up himself." This is most conclusive evidence that he was *Priest before he offered himself;* and consequently *before his death.* Any other view of the subject would leave us without a sacrifice; or at least without a sacrifice made by an authorized

Priest. But as clear as the matter now is; Paul has made it more so, if possible, in Rom. xv. 8. overthrowing *at once* all the arguments and objections that have been arrayed against the Priesthood of Jesus Christ. Hear his testimony upon this point.—"*Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision* for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers."

We have now shown most conclusively, that Jesus Christ was a *minister* of the circumcision, that he was inducted into the ministerial office by John at his baptism, that it was not for an example but to fulfil all righteousness, that in fulfiling the righteousness of the law which required a consecration by sprinkling, he met the approbation of the Father, and was anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows. All of which circumstances go to prove that our Savior was not baptized by immersion but by sprinkling.

The baptism administered to Christ, and that which is enjoined upon us, being essentially different, (not in mode) and administered for an entire different purpose; should we admit the correctness of the baptist sentiment, and follow the example of Christ by receiving *his* baptism; we thereby reject his authority in refusing to be baptized *in his name*, and are found transgressors of his law by not receiving *gospel* baptism.

Those who contend that Christ was baptized for an example involve themselves in the following difficulties:

1st. That no person should be baptized under 30 years of age, and consequently all those who die before they arrive at that age, must die *unbaptized* and out of the *Christian Church.*

2dly. We must not be baptized unto repentance or with any reference to the remission of sin, but to induct us into the ministerial office.

3 lly. If baptized to follow his example we must *not* be baptized in his *name*, and consequently in utter disregard of his authority in the command to the Apostles to baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

Query. Is it correct to disobey the plain command of Christ, under the pretence of following his example?

Notwithstanding we firmly believe that Christ was baptized by sprinkling, according to the Jewish method of induction into the ministerial office, yet we acknowledge that his baptism, or the baptism administered by John to others, affords no argument in relation to the mode of christian baptism, but that which is derived from the meaning of the word.—Still we claim it as a conclusive argument; for if the word *baptize*, describes an act which is known to be *sprinkling*, it is strong evidence against *immersion!*

BAPTISM OF THE EUNUCH.

The next case to which we shall attend, is that of the Ethiopian Eunuch, baptized by Philip; one of the seven deacons, appointed by the Apostles.—This is the strong hold of the immersionist; if immersion as the mode of baptism can be proved by Scripture, it can be done in this case: if they fail in this case, they must forever fail Now for the trial. It is said they "went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him." And now it is thought by some, that the matter is settled, and immersion proved. But we ask by what means? Is it by means of the word baptized? It is not; for we have shown that immersion is not the Scriptural sense of the word. Is it by means of the preposition *into?* certainly not, for a person can go into the water without being under it. There is as much evidence that Philip went into the water, as that the other did, and yet no one believes he went under it. Is it proved by the phrase, came up out of the water? Not at all; for coming out, as well as going into, expresses an act of his own, whereas, baptizing was the act of Philip. Observe, it is not said he was *put* in, and *taken* out; which is always the case when

baptized by immersion; but he *went* into, and *came* out; neither the *going* in, or *coming* out, was the baptism; one was *before* baptism, and the other *after* it; both being separate and distinct, from the act of baptism, and performed by another person. Here then, at the first approach, we discover their failure. But these are only the beginning of sorrows—Scarcely the tenth part of their difficulties in the case, has yet been presented. So far we have proceeded upon the supposition that they actually went into the water, and came out of it; and if, as we have seen that even in that case, there is no evidence of immersion; what a hopeless condition must they be in; when it is shown that they are destitute of proof that they were in the water at all. All the evidence we have that they were in the water, is derived from the prepositions into; and out of. It is known to the reader that our bible is but a translation; that the New Testament was written in Greek; and although the Scriptures were given by inspiration, and infallibly correct; yet there is a possibility of mistake in the translation. We have, therefore, an undoubted right to examine the original text that we may have the better opportunity of judging whether the translation is, or is not correct. If words had but one meaning, there would be but little danger of a misunderstanding, or mistranslation; but as most words are equivocal, having various meanings, we should be

careful not to depend too much upon them, especially when they occur but once or twice in the whole Scriptures. This being premised, we will now attend to the case before us. The reader is aware no doubt; if not he ought to be; that this is a solitary case; the only case recorded in the Scripture since the great commission was given to baptize the nations, that it is said they went into, unto, or towards water for the purpose of baptizing; this circumstance, is alone sufficient to make it extremely doubtful that immersion was the mode. But when we learn that the original word (*eis*), here rendered into, is an equivocal word; that it has above twenty different meanings—that in the gospel of Matthew alone it is translated by some other word beside *into*, seventy-seven times; and that it is, in the same chapter in which the baptism of the Eunuch is recorded, rendered to, five times, unto once, at once; and only twice rendered into, and that it is frequently used in the Scriptures when it could not possibly mean into, but only to, or unto; the reader cannot blame us for questioning the correctness of the translation and thinking it highly probable that the inspired writer used the word in this place, as he did in six other places in the same chapter, in the sense of *to*; or *unto*. We have asserted that (*eis*) the Greek word; (which they rely upon for proof that they were in the water) is an equivocal word, and that it is often

used when it could only mean *to*, or *unto*. We will now make that assertion good by giving a few plain examples. John xx. 4. Here it is said, the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first (*eis*) to the sepulchre. In the next verse it is said, yet went he *in*. How clear this example. Had this example been followed in Acts viii: 38, it would have read, "they went down both (*eis*) to the water," and with equal truth it might be said, yet went they not in.—Acts xxii: 7, "And I fell (*eis*) unto the ground," surely not into it. Again, Acts xxvi: 14, "And when we were all fallen (*eis*) to the earth;" John xi: 31, "She goeth (*eis*) unto the grave to weep there;" John xi: 38, "Jesus cometh (*eis*) to the grave. It was a cave and a stone lay upon it." Surely no one will suppose that either were in the grave, for the stone was not yet taken away. Romans x: 10, "with the heart man believeth (*eis*) unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made (*eis*) unto salvation;" 1 Cor. x: 2, "And were all baptized (*eis*) unto Moses." Will any one believe that six hundred thousand people were baptized *into* Moses? Again it is said, John xi: 32, "She fell down (*eis*) at Jesus feet." We have given these references to show that the word rendered into, Acts, viii: 38, might have been with equal propriety rendered to, or unto, which would take away every particle of evidence that they were in the water. And had it been

translated in this place, as the same word is in Acts ii: 38, it would read they both went down (*eis*) *for* the water and he baptized him. How clear it is then, that the text as written by the inspired penman. affords no evidence that they were in the water at all. But the immersionist still clinging to his theory, will say that the phrase "come up out of the water," verse 39, shows us what is the meaning of *eis*, in the original. Most gladly will we meet our opponents here; here we again feel the utmost confidence of success. The Greek word, here rendered out of, is *ek;* this word occurs in Matthew 65 times, is 15 times translated out of, and 50 times, by some other word. So we see, if that determines the meaning of *eis*, we have 50 to 15 against them. Reference to Grove's Lexicon will show this word to have 18 different meanings. We will give them to the reader in their proper order; *Ek*, 1st of, 2d from, 3d out of, 4th from within, 5th without, 6th outside, 7th off, 8th away from, 9th above, 10th beyond, 11th after, 12th since, 13th ever since, 14th by, 15th with, 16th for, 17th at, 18th in. Thus the reader will see that our translators gave it in this place, the third meaning instead of the first, or second; the first, in this sentence would not make good sense; because it would read come up *of* the water, but the second would undoubtedly express the sense of the original, "come up (*ek*) *from* the *water*." Thus we read

Acts vii: 3, "Get thee (*ek*) *from* thy kindred," not *out of* thy kindred. No doubt remains, that the translation of the passage in Acts viii: 38, 39, might have been they both went down *to*, or *unto* the water, and he baptized him. And when they were come up *from* the water, &c. But the immersionist being as unwilling to yield this point, as those who believe in the unconditional perseverence of the saints, are to give up their old hope; seeing their arguments all turned against their system, will try their hand at sophistry. If we find it necessary to do so we can meet them on their own principle, but we always prefer argument, when they are willing to yield to its force. We are gravely told, (for it needs much gravity to give it any appearance of argument,) that if *eis* means to, or unto, at, near, by, &c., that we have no evidence that the righteous will ever get into heaven, or the wicked be turned into hell. That when we go to heaven, we shall only be at, near, or by it. What sound logic! What conclusive reasoning! I would like to know who was the inventer of this species of argument. That, however, is of little consequence, it must be met.—And in the first place we will concede to them, all they would wish to prove by it; that is, we will allow that the preposition (*eis*) into, is full and positive proof of immersion; that their going into the water gives evidence of being under the water. This be-

ing conceded to them, they may adopt the language of scripture. "What then are we better than they? No, in no wise." For while they think *our* use of the word would only bring us to, at, or near heaven, *theirs* will take them under it. Thus we see the dust they have thrown at us, has only put out their own eyes. We see no cause to abandon the position that we have taken. There would be some force in their argument, if we contended that its only meaning was to, at, or near, and that it never means into, this however is not the case; our opponents know that we agree that *into*, is one of its meanings. And if they possess that degree of candor that ought to characterize christians, they will also agree that it is equivocal in its meaning, that it is frequently used in the Scriptures, in the sense of *to* or *unto;* and consequently by it they cannot sustain their theory. [See Note B.] For the better understanding of this matter we will submit the following case. Suppose the laws of our country prohibited the practice of immersion under the penalty of death; declaring that every person baptized by immersion should be hung by the neck until he was dead. A man is brought before the court charged with a breach of this law, by being immersed--he pleads not guilty. We have the same evidence before us, of his immersion, that we have of the immersion of the Eunuch.—There was positive proof that the person and the

Minister, both went down *into* the water; while there, the person was baptized; and after baptism was administered; they both came up out of the water. Would an unprejudiced jury pass sentence of death upon that individual? We may safely answer, No, They would not. They with one accord would say, (unless they were baptists of the most bigoted kind) that there was no evidence whatever of immersion in that case. Thus, after placing their arguments in the most favorable light; examining them all, with candor and with care, and giving them all the force that truth and justice, will possibly admit of, still every unprejudiced person must see that they not only fail to prove immersion; but that there is also a lack of evidence that the water was ankle deep, or even that there were ten gallons of water within one mile of that place. It is certainly wrong to conclude that because it is once mentioned that the person to be baptized and the administrator both went to, unto, into, or *for* the water, (for these are all proper meanings of the word (*eis*) and it has all these renderings in the Scriptures.) that this was necessary in every case of baptism, and that baptism was never administered without going to the water. Suppose a person to be traveling at a distance from home; after having been on his journey for the term of six months, he writes to his friends, informing them, (among many other things,) that on a certain

day he came to a stream of water and being thirsty he left his carriage—went to a stream of water and laid down to drink. What would be the proper inference in that case? That he never quenched his thirst during the whole journey without lying down to drink? Certainly not! No person possessing a proper share of common sense would arrive at such a conclusion; but exactly the reverse. Every person of intelligence would come to the conclusion at once; that this was the only time during his whole journey, that such a circumstance occurred.—Here then, you discover the whole weight of the argument lies against the immersion theory. Had we evidence that the Apostles, and disciples, *always* went to the water for baptism; or a sufficient number of times to show us that it was necessary in order to the administration of that ordinance; it would afford strong proof in favor of immersion; but as there is but *one* instance of the kind mentioned since the Apostles received their commission to baptize the nations, we have every reason to conclude that it is a *solitary case;* that it is the *only* instance in which any one of the early disciples of Christ ever went to the water for the purpose of baptizing any individual. But it may be asked; why is it so expressly said that they *both* went down to, or into the water? We answer not to afford argument in favor to immersion, but to shut the mouths of infidels. Had

this circumstance been left out of the history of the conversion and baptism of the Eunuch—had the Scriptures only informed us, that Philip went into the chariot—preached to the Eunuch—that the Eunuch was converted and baptized; the Infidel would at once say the whole account is false; that they had no water with which he could be baptized; that they being in a desert would not be able to procure water for baptism. Hence the propriety of informing us how they procured water with which to baptize. Had it been said *one* went to the water, they would ask, How could he carry water to the chariot? Is it likely that either of them had a vessel for that purpose? There would have been room for cavilling, had not the historian been thus particular in describing the whole circumstance, but as it is, there is none upon that point, that there was water, it is certain; how much there was, we know not, whether it was a spring, a river, or a lake; whether there was little, or much, was of such little consequence that he did not think it worth naming. Nor is it mentioned in any case of baptism administered by any of the Apostles, or disciples of Christ.—Wherever people lived, there water could be had in some quantity, *always* enough for baptism; though *seldom* enough for immersion, hence the inspired historian never tells us in any one case, (except the baptism administered in the desert,) how they pro-

cured water for the ordinance. The manner of obtaining water for baptism is of *no* consequence. The quantity used in administering the ordinance is *never* mentioned. The only thing that can be considered of importance, is the manner of applying it; hence we read in Scripture, "I will *pour* water upon him that is thirsty"—"I will *sprinkle* you *with* water"—"I baptize you *with* water—Ye shall be baptized *with* the Holy Ghost"—"So shall he *sprinkle* many nations." These expressions of Scripture give the clearest testimony that the water was applied to the person baptized, and not the person to the water.

There was something in the sermon preached by Philip that led the Eunuch to believe he ought to be baptized. Let us see what this was. We are informed he was reading the prophet Isaiah, the place of the Scripture which he read was this, "He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb dumb before his shearers, so he opened not his mouth" &c. The Eunuch made enquiry whether the prophet spake of himself or of some other man. We are informed that "Philip began at the same Scripture, and preached unto him Jesus." Not the same *verse;* for the Scriptures were not divided into verses until fourteen hundred years after this sermon was preached. Neither did he begin at the same chapter, because they were not divided into *chapters*, until twelve hundred years after that time. That the *same*

Scripture at which Philip began, when he preached does not mean the *particular verse* he was reading is evident from the fact that there were no verses at that time. Again the terms used are different; that which he was reading is called the "*place* of the Scripture;" the other is not so definite, it is only called "the *same Scripture*" not the same *place* of the *Scripture*. How clear it is then, that he explained the whole prophecy concerning the Mesiah, his life, his death, his humiliation, his exaltation, the ordinances of his house, the success, and final triumphs of his kingdom.—When "He shall see his seed—prolong his days and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands." This prophecy commences at the 13th verse of the 52 chapter of Isaiah, in the 15th verse we have the ordinance of baptism presented to view, and the manner of administering it clearly defined. The language is this, "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations." This was the only expression in that whole prophecy from which he could possibly learn that it was his duty to be baptized. How perfectly does this accord with the command of the Saviour Matthew 28. 19. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them," &c. and also with the prophecy of Ezekiel 36. 25, in reference to the same ordinance, "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you" &c. We are aware that some suppose that the expression, "*Sprinkle* many nations," cannot

mean *baptize* the nations because it is said that Christ should sprinkle the nations, and he commands his disciples to baptize them. This however is a mere quibble; does not the Scripture say, "they shall all be *taught* of God," and yet the Savior commissioned the Apostles to *teach* the nations at the same time he authorized them to *baptize*. Again it is expressly said that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples.—We may then understand the prophet, so shall Christ *baptize* or *sprinkle* many nations, though he himself shall not baptize, or sprinkle them but his disciples. If it still be said that *sprinkling* the nations—*pouring* water upon them—*sprinkling* them with water &c., does not mean *baptism*, we ask what then does it *mean?* Is it without meaning? Is there any other way in which we make use of water in a religious sense except in water baptism? Certainly not! Then unless these expressions are without meaning they must mean water baptism. How does it happen that with a certain class of people every thing that has the least appearance of favoring their system will be relied on as evidence, while full and clear testimony will be rejected if opposed to their views? There is no doubt but these passages of Scripture would have been claimed in support of their theory, did they but read *immerse*, *dip*, *plunge*, or *lurj*, instead of *sprinkle* or

pour. It is certain the Jews understood these expressions to mean baptism, because if these do not have that meaning, there are no promises contained in the prophecies by which they could understand that baptism was to be administered by Christ in the new dispensation. And yet it is certain that they did look for him to baptize; hence they say to John, "Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ; nor Elias, neither that prophet?"—John 1. 25. It may be thought strange by some individuals, that both *sprinkling* and *pouring* are used in reference to baptism. We would remark however that these words have so nearly the same meaning that they are used interchangeably; they both mean the application of that which is poured, or sprinkled; to the person, so that affusion, covers the whole ground of pouring and sprinkling. There must be but a slight degree of difference in the meaning of these words as they occur in Scripture. We will give an example; Job 36,–27. 28.—"He maketh small the drops of water: they pour down rain according to the vapor thereof; which the clouds do drop and distil upon man abundantly." Here we discover that the distiling of the small drops of water descending from the vapory cloud, which we would call *sprinkling*, is in the word of God called *pouring*. Such is the force of evidence in favor of this position, that *even* A. C. has yielded the point. He says in his debate with Mr.

M. page 163. "Sprinkling and pouring are actions so nigh to each other, and in effect so much the same, that *Raino* and the compounds of *Cheo*, are both translated sprinkle."

How often do we hear people in describing the same facts, use different language. We have many instances of this, in the Scripture. Paul, is the only writer of the New Testament, that uses the term alien, and reprobate, yet we presume no one will deny that others speak of the same persons, and use terms descriptive of the same character. Thus upon examination it will be found that the same individual that Paul calls an alien, a reprobate; Peter denominates disobedient, wicked, ungodly, and self-willed. John calls them Anti-christs, and lyars.—James calls them adulterers, and sinners. Jude calls them filthy dreamers, murmurers, complainers, and scoffers. Here are fourteen different terms, all descriptive of the same character. Can it then, be thought strange that there should be five terms used in the Scripture to designate the same act in performing the same ordinance? certainly not. At all events these terms are found; Baptize, pour, sprinkle; fell on us; shed forth this. Baptize, sprinkle, and pour, are certainly used in reference to the manner of applying the water to the person baptized.—Baptizing, pouring, sheding forth, falling upon, are used in reference to the baptism or gift of the Spirit.

The reason why the prophets Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Joel; did not use the term baptize, instead of terms signifying sprinkle and pour, is, they wrote in another language. Ezekiel says the water shall be sprinkled upon them, and the spirit given them; Isaiah says, the water shall be poured upon them, and the Spirit poured out upon them; and Joel, that the Spirit should be poured out upon them. Baptism being a Greek word was not used by the prophets, they used terms signifying sprinkle, and pour, both in reference to the use of water, and the gift of the Spirit. John speaking the Greek language, would undoubtedly use a Greek word; and although the same facts were to be set forth and the same use of water, and gift of the Spirit described; he says, "I baptize you with water, but Christ shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." Now all, who are not willingly ignorant do know, that every case of the baptism of the Holy Ghost is by pouring. Therefore, to be baptized with the Holy Ghost; means that the Holy Ghost shall be poured upon you. Hence the expression be baptized with water means that the water shall be poured upon the person baptized, unless the same term is used twice in the same sentence with two entire different meanings, which no man on earth can prove. And as we have clearly shown that the difference between pouring and sprinkling is merely nominal, both being used in reference to the

same thing, who will say with these facts before him that to sprinkle water, to pour water, to baptize *with* water, to sprinkle the nations, to baptize the nations, do not all have reference to one and the same thing? And now the reader has the facts of this case before him; it is for him to decide upon the question whether there is proof of the immersion of the Eunuch: we mean positive proof of a total immersion, for this is what the immersionist contends for, and unless the proof is so clear as to show the utter impossibility of baptizing by sprinkling or pouring; there is, on their part a complete failure; and consequently their strong hold is utterly demolished. We have nothing to fear from the most rigid criticism on the case now before us: we set out only with the expectation of convincing the unprejudiced, enquirer after truth that immersion could not be proved to be the mode of baptism, by the circumstances recorded in this chapter. If we have succeeded in doing this, our object is accomplished. But we ask, have we not done more than this? We think it has been shown not only, that immersion cannot be proven; but that taking into consideration all the circumstances, the probability of the case lies entirely against that mode. Certainly no candid person will believe that Philip would preach immersion from the word sprinkle; and as there was no other word in the prophecy concerning the Mesiah denoting the ordinance of baptism;

the conclusion is irresistable that he was baptized by effusion according to the prophetic declaration, "So shall he sprinkle many nations."—The following things must be proved before immersion can be sustained by the baptism of the Eunuch.

1st. That the writer did not use the word (*eis*) in the original, in this place, in the sense of to, or unto, as he did in six other places in the same chapter.

2nd. That it was in this place used in the sense of into; and that into, means under.

3rd. That (*Ek*) rendered out of, should not have its second meaning, *from;* instead of the third, out of.

4th. That there was water enough for immersion.

5th. That he was not baptized with water, but in it.

6. That he was baptized in a manner entirely different from the baptism of the spirit and contrary to the prophetic declaration; "So shall he (baptize) sprinkle many nations."

BURIED BY BAPTISM INTO DEATH.

We shall now call the readers attention to the passage in Romans 6th. Our Baptist friends some of them suppose the Apostle, in this place had an allusion to water baptism, some of them, I say; for the candid and intelligent do agree that this has nothing to do with water baptism. Indeed the Apostle must have been a very careless writer to pass through the whole sentence without mentioning water, if that was the subject under consideration. Who among us can believe he made such a mistake as to say we are buried by baptism into death; when he only meant we have been plunged under water? There is certainly a number of gross mistakes in the sentence if a literal burial in water was meant. Let us see what he says of the matter. "How shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also

in the likeness of his resurrection: Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin." Rom. vi. 2—7. To favor the views of our opponents the passage should have read; how shall we that have been immersed in water, live any longer in sin—Know ye not that so many of us as have been immersed into water, (not into Christ) were immersed into his water (not his death). Therefore we are immersed without him (being long after his immersion, and far from the place,) by immersion into water, that like as Christ was raised from the water by the arm of John, even so we also should walk on dry land!

The Apostle so far from having reference to water, in the text, does not use the term once in the whole chapter, and I believe not in that whole epistle. We are informed in this text that we are *crucified*, *planted*, *dead*, and *buried*. Now who will say that all those terms are to be understood literally? Surely no one in his senses. And yet it would be more reasonable to suppose them all *literal*, or all *figurative*, than to suppose the *burial literal*, and all the others *figurative*.

How absurd to suppose baptism to be a burial when the Apostle says we are buried *by* baptism, making one the *agent*, and the other the *action*, one

the *cause*, the other the *effect*. Yet the immersionist would contradict the Apostle and make both one; thereby palming upon the Apostle the absurdity of saying we are buried *by a buriel*, or *baptized by a baptism*. But the advocates of immersion still believing that the buriel means water baptism will ask if we can bury a man by pouring a little earth on him? I answer the mode, of burying is that of sprinkling or pouring, and not dipping or plunging. They sometimes tell us that if a man was sent to bury another and he should only sprinkle, or pour a little earth upon him, and then say he had buried him, it would be asserting a falsehood. But I ask, does not sprinkling, or pouring, (however small the quantity,) better represent the manner of burying, than the act of plunging? Most certainly. It is not necessary that the representative of a county be as large as the county he represents. It is not necessary that the figure of a house should be as large as the house it was designed to represent. It is not necessary in eating the Lord's Supper, that we eat a large quantity. The *manner* of eating is the same whether the *quantity* be great or small. In eating wholesome and poisonous food, the *act* of eating is the same; yet the *effect* produced will be entirely different! So the *act* of performing water baptism should agree with that of the Spirit which is, to "*pour out*," to "*shed forth*," to "*fall upon*;" but

the *effect* is quite different, *one*, only operating upon our physical system, not effecting a burial; the *other* exerting an influence on the inner man, producing a death to sin, (called a burial) hiding the life with Christ in God, and raising us to walk in newness of life. The application of water by sprinkling and pouring, is scriptural, and better represents the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, and the baptism of the Spirit, and also the manner of burying, than dipping or plunging, which is unscriptural. We now present the matter in such a light as to show most conclusively that when the apostle speaks of being *buried*, he has no reference to a literal burial in water.—The burial of which he speaks was not a momentary one, but one that continued till the time of writing that epistle. He says, "*we* ARE *buried*," Romans vi: 4. Now if it be contended that this burial was being under water, then it follows that the Apostle and those addressed by him were under the water at the time of writing that epistle, which is just about as probable as that the Apostle had any allusion to water baptism. So we see that an admission of what they would wish to prove by the word burial, involves them in the greatest absurdity imaginable, by proving that they were all under the water, both the writer and those addressed by him. I think the chance for writing under water would be poor indeed. And now let me ask, what would be thought of a man if

sent to bury another who would dip him into the earth or water, then pull him out, immediately place him upon dry land, and come back and say he is buried. There are those also who contend that planting signifies a total immersion; but I ask if it can be proved that this is the sense in which it is used in the Scriptures? Does David mean a total immersion when he says, Ps. i: 3, "He shall be like a tree planted *by* (not in) the rivers of water?"—"Those that be planted in the house of the Lord shall flourish in the courts of our God."—Ps. xcii: 13. Remember they were planted in the house of the Lord, not in a river, pond, or lake. If planting is baptism, they were *baptized* in the house of the Lord. Again, when Paul says, 1 Cor. iii: 6, "I have planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase," does he mean *he* immersed, and Apollos watered? There is not, I believe, one instance in which it is used in the sense of immersion in the whole Scriptures. And yet some have the wisdom to ask if it would answer to plant potatoes by sprinkling or pouring a little earth over them? I reply, it certainly would do as *well*, as it would to plunge them into the water and then throw them out on dry land! Thus it is seen most clearly that in this whole matter there was no allusion whatever to a literal burial in water, for he could not have been buried when writing, and yet he says, "We *are buried*."

He was *buried*, yet he had *risen*. He was *dead*, yet he was *living*. "Reckon ye yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin but alive unto God."—Romans vi: 11. In this sense a man may be dead and living at the same time. He may also be buried or excluded from the world. "for ye are dead and your life is hid with Christ in God."—Col. iii: 3. "Therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not."—1 John iii: 1. We are said to be "*buried with Christ*."—Rom. vi: 4. To be "*risen with* him."—Col. iii: 1. Neither of which can be true if taken literally according to the view of the immersionist, because to be *buried* LITERALLY *with* him and to *rise with* him, the burial and resurrection must be at the same time and the same place; which can be true only in reference to that baptism which changes our relation to the divine being, engrafts, or initiates us into Christ, so that we become the branches of the true vine. This the Apostle calls baptizing into Christ, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death."—Rom. vi: 3. Again, Gal. iii: 27, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Now if any one has the right to say that to be baptized into Christ, means to be baptized into water; I have the same right to say, that to put on Christ, means to put on water. So you discover the theory of our opponents would involve the

Apostle Paul in the nonsense of saying For as many of you as have been baptized into water, have put on water. The Apostle however clears himself from the charge, by declaring in the preceding verse that this is the effect of faith, and not water. "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." How clearly are these facts set forth in Col. ii: 10, 11, 12, 13. "And ye are complete in him (not in water) which is the head of all principality and power: In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, (not with hands) in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God who hath raised him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him having forgiven you all trespasses." Now had the Apostle told us they were buried in water, and raised by, or through the operation of the minister that baptized them, this text would afford some proof in their favor; but as it is, to infer that the burial is a baptism, and that the baptism is a plunging into water, would involve them in the absurdity of burying their converts in a plunge, or immersion into the water and leave them there to be raised through the *faith* of the

operation of *God*, or to remain immersed till the resurrection of the dead. When we take a scriptural view of this subject these difficulties all vanish, and we are not involved in any of the absurdities that necessarily belong to the theory embraced by our opponents. If we consider the whole matter referred to by the Apostle as the effect of the Spirit of God which produces a death to sin, forms the principle of union to Christ the living head, so that our life is hid with Christ in God, and at the same time risen with him to walk in newness of life, there will be no necessity for contradicting the Apostle. When the Apostle says, "we *are* buried," we would not have to say he only means we *have been*. When he says "we are buried with him by baptism into *death*," we would not have to say he means we are buried into *water*. But the difficulties of our opponents multiply as we proceed, we will close our remarks upon this passage, but not without letting the Apostle speak for himself in reference to the baptism which brings us into Christ, whether it be a literal burial in water as contended for by our opponents, or otherwise—"For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ"—Gal. iii: 27. "So many of us as have been baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death"—Rom. vi: 3. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles"—1 Cor. xii: 13.

In the preceding verse the Apostle tells us that the different members compose the body, and that all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. He then tells us that the principle of union which brings both Jews and Gentiles into that one body is the baptism of the spirit; "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body."—If any one will still believe water baptism to be that which the Apostle calls baptizing into Christ, let him believe it, for the same Apostle says, "if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant." Before the passage under consideration can be made to sustain the immersion theory, the following things must be proved:

1st. That Paul meant *water* baptism when he says baptized into *Christ*.

2d. That he meant buried by baptism into *water*, when he said buried by baptism into *death!*

3d. When he said we *are* buried, that he was actually under water at the time of writing, or else asserted what was not true in saying "we *are* buried."

4th. That Planting was used by him in the sense of a total immersion.

5th. That the Psalmist was widely mistaken in talking about being planted in the house of the Lord.

6th. That the Christian baptism is not a baptism *with* water, but *in* it.

7th. That the mode of water baptism is entirely different from the baptism of the Spirit, which is always by pouring.

8th. That Paul was mistaken in saying, "we are buried *with* him, when it was neither at the same time, or same place.

9th. That the *mode*, or manner of burying, is not *pouring* but *plunging*.

10th. And lastly, that they were literally *crucified*, and literally *dead*, as well as literally *buried*.

BAPTISM OF LYDIA.

The baptism of Lydia, recorded Acts xvi: 15, has by some, been thought to favor immersion. But I know of no argument that could be drawn from the circumstances recorded in that chapter that will in the least countenance that opinion. It may be asked; were they not "by the river side?" We answer, yes: but of course they could not be in the *river* while they were by its *side!* Nor did they even go to the "river side" for baptism, but for prayer. There is just as much proof that they went into the water for prayer, as that they did for baptism. The matter, then, stands thus, in all cases in which the christian baptism was administered, whether they were in a city or a house, there is no evidence that they ever left the city or house for the purpose of administering the ordinance.

If it was the practice of the apostles and disciples of Christ to leave the place of preaching for baptism, why is it not recorded in Scripture? Neither the inhabitants of Jerusalem, or of Samaria, are said to go out of their respective cities, though many were baptized: nor is it said that those baptized at the house of Cornelius, or Saul, or the household of

Stephanas, or any other, went out of the house to be baptized.

Should it be said that Philip and the Eunuch went to the water for baptism; I reply, I have no objection to have any person go to the water for baptism under like circumstances, but I ask, is it right *always* to leave the house (where water could be had) for baptism; because people *once* left a chariot (where water could not be had) to baptize?

Now if our Baptist friends would never go to the water for baptism only when they were placed under precisely the same circumstances; or if they would not contend that we should do *more* when there, than they can prove to have been done by them, we should not complain, but to contend that we must *always* go to the water, or into the water, then be *put under* the water; and that no baptism is scriptural unless administered according to their peculiar views, is contending for more than the word of God will warrant, and is no part of that "*faith that was once delivered to the saints*.

BORN OF THE WATER AND OF THE SPIRIT.

The next passage that demands our attention is found in John iii. 5, "Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." It is most certainly handling the word of God deceitfully, or a clear manifestation of ignorance, to bring this as an evidence of the mode, or design of water baptism. Some have thought that this passage is recognized in our discipline as refering to the mode or design of water baptism. But we think it clear, that it is required to be used only as an evidence that we stand in need of the new birth. Wesley says, "Baptism is not the new birth." Sermon on the new birth, Vol. 1. page 404. Our discipline says baptism is a sign of regeneration or the new birth. This, then, must be understood as refering to our need of *spiritual regeneration*, and not as an evidence of the mode or design of *that* which *only represents* the new birth! The text before us either has reference to one man, or it has reference to all men. This, we think, will not be denied. If it has reference to only one man, Nichodemus, no doubt was that man, and consequently we have no concern in the matter. If it has reference

to all men; either it does not mean water baptism, or every person in every age and dispensation of the world, that has not been baptized with water, must be excluded from the kingdom of God. Who is prepared for such a conclusion as this? Not one! Again, there is not a single passage in all the word of God that calls water baptism a birth. Paul says, Galatians iv. 19. "My little children, of whom I travail in birth again, until Christ be formed in you. I desire to be present with you," &c. If the birth here spoken of, means water baptism, according to the sentiment we oppose, then we must believe the Apostle had these children at Galatia, to whom he was writing,) in the water, and was laboring to get them out. How absurd! And yet it is the only legitimate conclusion, from the premises established by our opponents. Once more, if to be born of water, is water baptism; to be born of the Spirit, is spiritual baptism; so that immersion cannot be meant, but pouring. Again, if to be plunged into the water, and taken out, is to be born of water; then to be born of the Spirit, we must be plunged into the Spirit and taken out. Thus our opponents involve themselves in the greatest absurdities imaginable by supposing this text has reference to water baptism. It surely is not necessary to understand that to be born of water, and of the Spirit, means that we must be born twice, once of the water and once of the Spirit.

If it is, then to worship God in Spirit, and in truth, John iv. 24, means two acts of worship, one in Spirit, and the other in truth. If the Savior meant a literal burial in water he had not the most happy method of instruction; for after all the explanation he gave upon the subject, Nichodemus still wondered, and said "how can these things be," verse 9? Had the Savior been an immersionist, and designed to teach immersion; or had this case been submitted to one of our modern immersionists, the reply would have been, "All I mean is, that you must be plunged under water."

For the better understanding of this matter we will give a few examples in which water is used to represent the Spirit, or spiritual influence. John iii 5, "Except a man be born of water, (then by way of explanation, he adds) and of the Spirit." John iv. 14, "The water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." John vii. 38, 39, "He that believeth on me—out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive." Isaiah lv. 3, "with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation." Zach. xiv. 8, "In that day shall living waters go out from Jerusalem," Isaiah liii. 1, "Ho every one that thirsteth come ye to the waters." We will now give some examples in reference to being born.

John iii. 7, "Ye must be born again." 1 John v. 1, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." 1 John v 4, "Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world, and this is the victory, even our faith." 1 John iv: 7, "every one that loveth is born of God." 1 John v: 18, "We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not." 1 Peter i, 23:—"Being born again not of corruptible seed but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." John i, 12, 13, "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." Here John declares that the power to become the sons of God was given to them that believe; not to those that baptize them to make them the sons of God. And if water baptism is meant, John was mistaken in saying they were not born of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, for water baptism cannot be performed without the will of man. The Savior so far from intending to teach water baptism, in his explanation of the birth, says no more about water during the whole conversation, but tells him that a man necessarily partakes of the nature of that of which he is born. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit," and it is equally clear that that which is lite-

rally born of water, is water. But the Savior finding that he was misapprehended, and that he was understood to be speaking of earthly things, endeavor to make it plain to his understanding by telling him that the birth of which he spoke, this is, to be born of the spirit was something like the mysterious operation of the wind, that its nature could not be comprehended, though its effects were so sensibly felt, that its existence could not be denied. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the spirit." Nichodemus still in the dark, inquires "how can these things be?"—verse 9. In the 12th Christ says, "If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things?" Thus declaring, that if he could not understand and believe what he had told him in relation to the wind and its effects, which he calls earthly things, he certainly need not expect to understand and believe what he said in relation to being born of water and of the spirit, which he calls heavenly things. The reason why he could not believe these things, was, he did not understand them. The reason he did not understand them is given by the Apostle Paul, in 1 Cor. ii. 14, "the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, be-

cause they are spiritually discerned." This was the reason Nichodemus did not understand what it meant to be born again. and we fear this is the reason why so many in the present day refer it to a literal birth of water, or water baptism, rather than acknowledge that it has reference to the influence of the spirit of God, translating us out of the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear son. (See note C.) And now, at the close of this subject, we would say, there are five things to be proved before the passage under consideration can be made subservient to the immersion theory.

1st. That to be born of water and of the spirit, a man must be born twice, and that these births are separate and distinct from each other, one the work of man, the other the work of God.

2d. That being born of water, means nothing more nor less than water baptism.

3. That the mode of water baptism is entirely different from the scriptural account of the baptism of the Spirit namely that of pouring.

4. That in every age of the world all unbaptized persons must be excluded from the Kingdom of God.

5. That to be born of water, and of the Spirit, we must be plunged into them, and taken out as soon as possible. Can all this be proved.

BAPTISM AT THE HOUSE OF CORNELIUS.

The language of Peter at the house of Cornelius, give evidence that he did not think it necessary to leave the house for baptism. "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we."—Acts x. 47. Would it not be the most consumate nonsense to talk about forbiding the water upon the supposition that the people were about to leave the house and repair to some distant stream for the purpose of baptizing in it? Streams affording a sufficient quantity of water for immersion are public property and all have an equal right at least to some portion of them. Not so with the waters of a well, or that which people have in their houses; we have no right to a sufficient quantity to quench our thirst without asking for it. Peter being in another man's house does not usurp authority and demand the water with which to baptize, but modesty enquires, "Can any man forbid water," thereby giving evidence that the water was to be brought. No man can see the propriety of talking about forbiding the water if the people were going to the water. But if he wanted water brought, in that case it might be

forbidden. If one person was going to another that was not moving at all, and a third person did not wish to have them together, which would he be the most likely to forbid; the one that was moving, or the one that was not? Common sense would say in all cases, let the moving object be forbidden. If the water was to be brought, let the water be forbidden; if on the other hand, the people were going to the water, let the objector forbid the people, but not the water. There is not the least particle of evidence that they left the house for baptism.

SAUL'S BAPTISM.

Saul's Baptism is not only, not favorable to immersion but much against it. If attention is paid to the subject it will be found that whenever it was necessary to move from one place to another, there was a command given, and a verb used expressing the *act* to be performed. "Arise and *go* into the city," Acts ix. 6. In obedience to the command it is said, "he arose and they *led* him by the hand and *brought* him into Damascus," verse 8. The Lord said unto Annanias, "Arise and *go* into the street which is called straight." verse 11 "And Annanias *went* his way, and *entered* into the house," verse 17. Annanias does not say to Saul arise and *go* to be baptized. You recollect that when Saul and Annanias were required to go from one place to another, the verb expressing that act is used, "Arise and *go*," but Saul was only required to *arise;* not the least intimation is given of his moving one step for baptism. Indeed his baptism was entirely different from that of the immersionists; for, as far as I know, they always *lie down* to be baptized, which was not the case with Saul; for he *arose* to be baptized, which in plain english means to *stand up*. The verb ANAS-

TAS which expresses the act of Saul's rising up, occurs Mark xiv: 60, "And the high priest (ANASTAS) *stood up* in the midst." Here then we have indubitable testimony that the Apostle was baptized standing up. If any one can believe that he was baptized by immersion, he can believe not only without evidence, but contrary to evidence; in the case of such individuals testimony and argument will be of no avail.

BAPTISM OF THE ISRAELITES.

We shall now attend to the case of the baptism of the Israelites at the time of their passage through the sea. It is frequently said by the advocates of immersion that this was only a figure of baptism; but why do they say this? Is it because there is any thing in the Old or New Testament that will warrant such a conclusion? Certainly not. But because they know that an admission of the truth in reference to this matter, will utterly demolish their system. As they well know that there was not a *real immersion*, they would shield themselves against the sword of the Spirit, and the force of truth, by denying that there was in this case a *real baptism*. Lest it may be thought by those who are not acquainted with the facts of the case, that we either misunderstand or misrepresent them, I will now give the views of A. Campbell taken as given by *himself* in his debate with McCalla on the 302 page. I shall give them as expressed by himself, leaving out what he says in regard to McCalla. "As for the Israelites being baptized unto Moses, although it was a figure only, we see the allusion so plain in the cloud and in the sea that we cannot mistake. They walk-

ed on the bottom of the Red Sea, the water stood like a wall on both sides, and the cloud covered their heads. Recollect my friends, they were not baptized only in the sea, but in the cloud and sea taken together. The two, the cloud above, and the water on each side, completely overwhelmed them. I dont think that a drop of water fell on them; no, they travelled as on dry land, and the mere circumstance of their being surrounded with water and covered with a cloud is called their baptism." Now, if A. Campbell was not a great man, I should be inclined to think he had committed several egregious errors in reference to this matter. But if it be true, (as too many think) that he cannot *err* in such matters, then the inspired writers of the Old and New Testaments have been wofully mistaken. And as Mr. C. in giving *his* views has taken liberty to contradict Paul, Moses, and the Psalmist, I shall certainly take the liberty to dissent from him, and point out his mistakes. Paul tells us they "*were all baptized*," 1 Cor. x: 2. Mr. C. contradicts this by saying "it was a figure only," if it was a *figure* only, why does not Paul say they were all *figuratively baptized?* Again he says they were "surrounded with water and covered with a cloud." Now let me say that at the time of their passage through the sea there is not the least particle of evidence that they were either surrounded with water or covered with

a cloud. Moses informs us that the "Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night and the waters were divided." Surely this cannot mean that there was *water* all *around* them *both before* and *behind* and that it was not open from shore to shore! Mr. C. will have it also, that the clould was *over them* so as to constitute an *overwhelming*. But Moses informs us, that before the waters were divided, the cloud had passed from "*before their face* and *stood behind them*: And it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel, and it was a cloud and darkness *to them*, but it gave light by night to these: so that one came not near the other all the night," Exodus xiv: 19, 20, 21. There is nothing more clear than that while the cloud was between the Egyptians and Israelites, being a cloud and darkness to the Egyptians, and a source of light to the others, the Israelites passed over; for from the 27th verse we learn that when the morning appeared Moses stretched his hand over the sea, and the sea returned to his strength, and the Egyptians were overthrown in the midst of the sea. After having shown that Mr. C. comes out in direct opposition to the testimony of ***Paul*** and ***Moses***, we will enquire whether he will agree any better with the ***Psalmist***. He has not the hardihood to come out plainly and say *positively* that the Psalmist *was mistaken*, but very modestly says, "***I dont think that***

a drop of water fell on them." This is certainly a very modest way of contradicting the words of inspiration. He might as well have said, I don't think the Psalmist knew as much as *I do* about that matter. Now I agree with him, that the water with which they were baptized did not fall from the cloud upon them during the time of their passage through the sea, because we have no evidence that the cloud was over them at that time. Nor shall I attempt to say whether the water fell as the cloud went from before and stood behind them before their entrance into the sea; or immediately after they arrived upon the opposite shore; nor is it a matter of any consequence to us whether it was *before*, or *after* their passage through the sea, or whether it was *both*. We are satisfied with the facts revealed upon that subject, which are, 1. That the Israelites were *baptized*, 2. That they were neither *diped into* the *cloud*, nor *plunged into* the *sea*. 3. That they were not *surrounded* with water, for the waters were *divided* so as to be on their *right hand* and on their *left*. 4. That the cloud was not over them while in the sea, for it had passed from *before* and *stood behind them*. 5. That either *before*, or *after* their passage through the sea *or both*, there was an action of the cloud which the Apostle Paul denominated *baptism*. Let us now enquire what that was. We are aware that the witnesses we are about to examine will flatly con-

tradict Mr. Campbell's statement of this matter; but we think truth ought not to be suppressed though it should prove the word of every man untrue. We will first introduce the testimony of Asaph, as recorded in the seventy-seventh Psalm. "The waters saw thee, O God, the waters saw thee; they were afraid: the depths also were troubled. The clouds *poured out water;* the skies sent out a sound: thine arrows also went abroad: The voice of thy thunder was in the heaven: the lightnings lighted the world; the earth trembled and shook. Thy way is in the sea, and thy path in the great waters, and thy footsteps are not known. Thou leddest thy people like a flock by the hand of Moses and Aaron." We next introduce Josephus, the Jewish historian, not to establish any fact that is not revealed in the Scripture, (for the Scripture clearly establishes all the facts that we are required to believe in order to our salvation), but to show that he was not such an unbeliever upon this point as Alexander Campbell. Hear then, his statement. "As soon therefore, as the whole Egyptian army was within it, the sea flowed to its own place, and came down with a torrent raised by storms of wind, and encompassed the Egyptians. Showers of rain also came down from the sky, and dreadful thunders and lightnings, with flashes of fire."* All this, (according to Josephus) took place while the

*Chapter 16, page 61.

Egyptians were overwhelmed in the sea, and the Israelites safe upon the shore!

We have learned from the testimony of Asaph, what the action of the cloud was, which ***Paul*** calls *baptism.* We will now hear ***David*** in regard to the design of God in sending the shower by which they were *baptized.* "Thou, O God, didst send a plentiful rain, whereby thou didst *confirm* thine inheritance when it was weary."—Psalm, lxviii: 9. Not a mere *accidental shower,* but one sent for the *express purpose of confirming,* (or in the New Testament language) *baptizing* the people of God. The Israelites, then, were not *figuratively,* but *really baptized;* yet they were neither *really,* nor *figuratively immersed.* The Egyptians were neither *really,* nor *figuratively baptized;* yet they were *really* and *totally immersed.* In Exodus, xii: 27, we learn that there about six hundred thousand on foot, that were men, beside children. What a multitude baptized by *pouring*;—by the rain which was sent for the *express purpose of confirming them.* Let Mr. Campbell then, with others, declare that there was no *rain,* that the clouds did not *pour out water;* that they were *surrounded* with water;—that the cloud was over them while *in the sea;*—that Paul was mistaken in saying they were *baptized,*—that it was only a figure of baptism; and that there *can* be no *real* baptism without *immersion;* we trust that every unprejudiced

reader will see that in denying all these facts, and contradicting so many inspired writers, he has indeed cut a very strange *figure*. His ingenuity must be put very much upon the rack, or he certainly never would be found occupying such *untenable* and *unenviable ground*. Whenever *he* can contrive to baptize as many people by *immersion*, (as he says *these* were,) without one drop of water touching them, immersionists will certainly be no longer under the necessity of *digging out troughs*, or *building dams* for that purpose; and will probably convince some of us that *immersion* was the ancient mode of *baptism*. But it may be said, that this was not the Christian baptism. I would ask how this is known? Were they destitute of a Savior? Paul immediately adds; "And did all *eat* the same *spiritual meat* and did all *drink* the same *spiritual* drink, for they drank of that *spiritual* Rock that followed them and that Rock *was Christ*." No doubt but those who think it was a FIGURATIVE *baptism*, will also believe it was a *figurative Christ*, and a *figurative* salvation. But those who believe the declaration of the Apostle will believe otherwise; that is, that it was a *real baptism*, a *real Christ*, and a *real salvation from bondage*, all that is said by Alex. Campbell to the contrary notwithstanding. How astonishing it is, that people will reject such plain testimony as that given by Paul, Moses, Asaph, and David, rather than give up a *fa-*

vorite theory that has no *foundation* in the word of God! It is now clear that these inspired witnesses were all mistaken; or, there is a gross mistake on the part of those who believe baptism cannot be performed without an immersion. The Israelites were *baptized* but were not *immersed;* the Egyptians were *immersed*, but were not *baptized;* therefore *baptism* and *immersion* are not one and the same thing, if the word of God is to be relied on as evidence.

ONE BAPTISM.

It is supposed that the expression we have "One Baptism," favors the idea that baptism must invariably be administered in one mode. This, however, is not a logical conclusion. If there were a dozen ways of administering the *ordinance*, should it be but *once* administered, there would be but one *baptism*. It would be just as reasonable to conclude that because there was more than one road in which people could travel to the seat of government of the United States, that we had more than one seat of government. Or that because the different States did not proceed on the same principle and vote precisely in the same manner for President; that therefore they had not the same *President;* and consequently more than *one.*

Again, if three men should travel to a certain village, one in a *carriage*, one on *horseback*, and the other on *foot*, would this prove that the village was not one, and the same, because the manner of travelling to it was different? Certainly not. If the Apostle has reference to water baptism, and one baptism means *but one;* this declaration stands opposed to the practice of *re-baptizing;* and not at

all against the different modes of administering it. Indeed, if Paul had said *one mode* of *baptism;* I do not see how it could be claimed in favor of immersion, as the baptism of the Spirit is undeniably by pouring, so that if we have *but one mode*, that *one mode* is certainly pouring, and not immersion. If the immersionist can prove that "one baptism," in this place is *water* baptism; and that the "one baptism" means only *one mode* of *administering it;* and that the mode in which it is to be administered is *immersion; then*, and not till *then;* can he claim it as favoring his views.

BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD.

"Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all?"

This has also been claimed to support the immersion theory. Campbell has translated it, "immersed for the dead." This passage, however, means no more, than that if Christ be not raised from the dead, then those who are baptized by his authority are baptized for the dead. Paul says, "if Christ be not raised your faith is vain." We do not *labor*, or perform any *act* for the *dead*, but for the *living*. So that the fact of our baptism in the name, and by

the authority of Christ, gives evidence of our faith in the resurrection. How then, (says the apostle) say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead.

BODIES WASHED WITH WATER.

The next passage that claims our attention is found Heb. x. 22. "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." Now if our opponents can only prove that the Apostle in this place means nothing *more nor less* than *water baptism*; and that the word *wash*, signifies nothing more nor less than *immersion*, they will have sustained their sentiment. If we should allow them to claim it as meaning water baptism; which they could by no means prove; still it would not be an easy matter to prove that *wash*, and *immerse*, are synonymous *terms*. The question is not whether washing may be performed by dipping or immersing, but whether *immersion* is absolutely necessary in order to the *performance of that act*. We read Job ix. 30. "If I wash myself in snow,"—did he mean a mere dipping into the snow? or, that he made use of snow instead of water, for the purpose of cleansing? John xiii. 8, "If I wash thee not thou hast no part with me." Did he mean an immersion? If so he must have plunged him into the bason which he held in his hand. Luke vii. 38—44. We have evidence that the feet of the

Savior were washed with tears; but who among us will believe that they were immersed? Titus iii. 5, "washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost which he shed on us." Here we are said to be washed with that which is shed on us, not the plunging of regeneration. Exodus xxix. 4, "And Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and shalt *wash* them with water."—not *dip* them *in it*. Numbers viii. 7. "And thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them; *sprinkle* water of purifying upon them." Rev. i. 5, "washed us from our sins in his own blood." "Washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." Rev. vii. 14. 1 Peter i. 2, we read of the sanctification of the Spirit, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. Therefore *washing* in the Scripture is by *sprinkling*, or *shedding upon*, rather than *immersion*. But we are sometimes asked if clothes can be washed by sprinkling or pouring water upon them. We reply just as well as by a mere dip, or plunge. We ask what would be thought of a servant girl, if sent to wash children, who would plunge them into water and let them go dripping wet?

It is by no means certain that the word *wash* signifies in any place in the Scriptures a *total immersion* of that which was to be *cleansed* or *washed;* but it is *absolutely certain* that washing may be *per-*

formed without a total or even a *partial dipping.*— But it may be said that the Apostle speaks of having the *body washed;* and we are sometimes asked if pouring water on the head can have any resemblance to a *washing of the body.* We suppose that the Apostle uses the term *body* in reference to the outward man, and that the head will represent it as well as any other part. When the ointment was poured upon the Savior's head, Matthew xxvi. 7, the Savior so far from understanding that the head and body were not the same, says in reference to what had been done to him, "For in that she hath *poured* this ointment on my *body*, she did it for my burial;" 12th verse. Here it will be seen that the Savior called the *head* the *body;* and as Paul was a disciple of Jesus we have no right to accuse him of using terms in a different sense.

Thus it is seen that there is nothing in this passage favoring immersion, but the contrary idea is set forth; the Apostle says washed *with* water, not *in* it!

FIGURE OF BAPTISM IN THE ARK.

We next enquire whether the passage in 1 Pet. iii. 20, 21, is at all favorable to the immersion theory. We know it is claimed in support of it, but without truth or reason.

"While the ark was preparing wherein few, that is eight souls, were saved by water. The like figure whereunto *even* baptism doth also now save us," &c. This is the *only figure* spoken of in the Scripture in reference to *baptism*. The question to be decided is, whether the circumstance here recorded better answers to the idea of *immersion*, than to that of *pouring*. The immersionist says it *does*. I say it *does not!* So far then, as it relates to *assertion*, we are on *equal footing*. But how is it in regard to the facts of the case? We will see. Gen. vii. 4, "For yet seven days, and I will cause it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights."—Gen. xi. 12, "All the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened. And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights." In the 7th verse we learn that Noah and his family had entered into the ark before the water fell upon the earth; in the 18th

that the ark went upon the *face* of the waters, not *under* the water. Neither the *ark*, nor *those in it* were *immersed*, but were borne *above* the waters, and the *figure* was certainly that of *pouring;* for as the water *descended*, and *fell upon the ark over them*, it properly *prefigured* or *represented baptism* by *pouring*, but surely could have no resemblance to an *immersion!* The water did not fall ON them, as in the case of the Israelites when God sent the rain to *confirm* them, but it fell OVER them, constituting thereby the *figure* of the *christian baptism!* But it may be said they were *in* the *ark*, and therefore *immersed*. I suppose then, according to this, when a person is baptized by *pouring*, that it is also *immersion*, if he be baptized in a *house*. We hope therefore, we shall hear no more complaints on that subject! Thus we see that *all the facts* of the case, are entirely opposed to the immersion theory, and clearly establish baptism by *pouring*. So that if we are to be *saved* by *baptism*, AS Noah was saved by *water*, we must be saved by being *kept out* of the water, and not by *being put in*. Noah was a pardoned man; and a preacher of righteousness a hundred and twenty years before he entered into the ark, consequently was not saved by that means from the guilt of sin, and as those who were *immersed* on that occasion were *drowned*, and *lost*, as well as those who were *immersed* in the Red Sea; we ne-

cessarily arrive at the conclusion that the Scriptures no where teach that *baptism* is IMMERSION, or that *immersion* is BAPTISM.

BAPTISM OF THE HOLY GHOST.

From the circumstances recorded in the second and tenth chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, we may learn; (with the help of corresponding passages,) the *precise sense* of the word *baptism* as used by the inspired writers. Our opponents are not agreed in regard to this baptism, whether it was *real* or only *figurative*. Those who believe they were *immersed in the* SPIRIT on those occasions, will acknowledge it *real;* while those of them who have examined the matter closely, knowing that there is no evidence of *immersion* will say it is used *figuratively*. I shall not attempt to decide which of these are most in fault, those who are ignorant *because they will not learn;* or those who *having learned, will not confess the truth*. Suffice it to say *both* are *wrong*. There was a *real baptism*; and yet it was not by *immersion*. Who can believe that John meant, I *baptize* you with *water*, but Christ shall *figuratively baptize* you with the ***Holy Ghost?*** If it was only *figurative*, why cannot that fact be learned from the *Scripture?* The *same term* is used in reference to *both*. *One*, is as much called a *baptism* as the *other;* consequently, if John's bap-

tism was *real, so must the other be!* Our next enquiry shall be in reference to the mode of administering it; for if, as we have already seen, it was a *real baptism;* whenever we can ascertain the *manner* or *mode,* in which it was *administered;* controversy upon this subject should *forever cease.* The grand question now to be decided is, *how were they baptized?* Were they *dipped, plunged, immersed into the* SPIRIT or was it *poured* upon those that were *baptized* with it? The immersionists who believe it was a *real baptism* declare that there was a *real immersion* into the Spirit. But where is their proof? *They* say it is in the *Scriptures; we say it is not!* Now as one assertion is worth as much as the *other,* this will not decide the question. We shall therefore have to take an *appeal.* But where shall we go? I am aware that the immersionist would gladly appeal to *Baptists, Paidobaptists,* and *Lexicographers!* But I would say to them, if ye receive the witness of *men;* the witness of *God* is greater; and if ten thousand men could be brought that would array themselves against the word of God, we must reject their testimony, for the Scripture assures us "That the world by wisdom knew not God." And again that "He taketh the wise in their own craftiness." We shall therefore take an appeal from them to the sacred oracles, with the express understanding however, that a large majority of their own witnesses,

(or those claimed by them) if fairly examined, will testify against their system.

We now call for the proof, from the Scriptures, that the baptism of the Holy Ghost was by *immersion.* Baptist. Acts ii. 2, "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and IT FILLED ALL THE HOUSE WHERE THEY WERE SITTING." "Consequently, there must have been an immersion if the house was filled, and they were in it at the time." Supposing we *admit* all this? The next question is, into what were they immersed? Was it the Spirit, or the sound that filled the house? "Why—Why"—(says the baptist;) "I suppose it was the *sound.*" Most certainly sir, you are right *once;* it was the *sound* that filled the house. What next; verse 3, "And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them." And what follows? Verse 4, "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost." Very well. We have then, three things distinctly pointed out, and following each other in quick succession; first, the *sound,* which *filled* the *house;* secondly, the cloven tongues like as of *fire* which *sat* upon them; and thirdly, the ***Holy Ghost,*** with which they were *filled!* We now ask, where is the evidence so desirable to the advocates of the immersion theory; namely, that the baptism of the Holy Ghost was an *immersion*? I boldly affirm it is not to be found,

for although the *sound filled the house* and they were overwhelmed in it; yet the Scripture nowhere calls it a baptism. And even if they were baptized in *sound* (which was not the case) it was not by *dipping* or *plunging* into it, but it *came down, descended upon them!* But says the immersionist, "I can prove IMMERSION by a host of *commentators, baptists, paidobaptists,* and *lexicons.*" But stop, not so fast sir! What are all these when arrayed against the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God? "Let God be true, but every man a liar." Yes, every man that denies the *truth* of *God.* But what *is truth?* 1st. It is *true* that *John baptized with water,* and that *Christ baptized with the Holy Ghost.* 2nd. It is *true* that this was not a *figurative,* but a *real baptism.* 3d. It is *true* that this *baptism* was not an *immersion* in the *Spirit.* 4thly. It is *true* (or, the word of God is *false*) that the baptism of the *Holy Ghost* was by *pouring.* Joel prophesied that it *should* be by *pouring;* and Peter says it *was* by *pouring;* Joel ii. 28, 29.—Acts ii. 17, 18.—"This is that which was spoken by the Prophet Joel: And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit," &c. Acts ii. 33, "having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear." Again, Acts xi. 15, 16, "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost *fell* on them as on

us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." Now if Peter had said, they were *immersed in* the Holy Ghost as we were at the beginning, the immersionist would have had *one passage* at least in his *favor*, but as it *is*, there is not, (when rightly understood,) one particle of evidence to sustain his theory.

When John says I *baptize* you with *water* but he (Christ) shall *baptize* you with the ***Holy Ghost***, he either *does*, or *does not use* the word *baptize* in both places in the *same sense*. This will not be denied. If he *does not use it* in the *same sense* in both places, then that word must have different meanings in the Scripture; is an equivocal word, and consequently all the force of the argument derived from the meaning of it is entirely lost. If it is used in precisely the *same sense* in *both places;* and John intended thereby to *specify the same act;* then it *clearly* and *manifestly demolishes* the whole *immersion theory*. That this passage is ruinous to their system, is certain from the following facts: 1st. John uses the *same word twice* in one sentence without giving the *least intimation* that he intended to specify *two different acts* by the use of the word *baptize*. 2nd. When he said he shall *baptize* you with the Holy Ghost; he did not mean an *immer-*

sion in the Holy Ghost, therefore, to be *baptized with water*, does not mean to be *immersed in it!* 3d. It is *absolutely certain* that when *baptized* with the *Holy Ghost* it was *poured* upon them; therefore the *act* specified by the word *baptize*, (as used by John,) is that of *pouring* and not an *immersion!*

And lastly, The bible defines the word in such a way as to exclude entirely the idea of immersion as connected with christian baptism. This is undoubtedly the correct standard of appeal, for a definition of its own terms.

What then, says the bible in regard to *baptism?* Let us see. Baptism—to "*Pour out*," Acts xi. 45. and 18—to "*Shed forth*," Acts ii. 33—"*fell on all them*," Acts xi 44—"*was poured out*," Acts xi. 45. "And as I began to speak, the HOLY GHOST FELL ON THEM, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be *baptized with the Holy Ghost.*" Who then, will have the audacity to say that, that with which they were *baptized* was not *poured out;* was not *shed forth;* and that it did not *fall on them?* Not only is this definition given in three terms, expressing the same *act*; that is affusion; by means of *pouring out; shedding forth;* and *falling on;* but there *is no other* definition of the word, given in the New Testament, which would authorize *any other act*, in performing

the *ordinance of baptism* but that of *affusion.* And further, there is not a *single circumstance*, recorded in connection with *baptism*, either in the Old or New Testament, which does not clearly correspond with the idea of baptism by *pouring* according to the Scriptural definition of the word *baptize.* What Ezekiel calls *sprinkling* water upon them; and puting the Spirit within them; Isaiah calls *pouring water* upon them, and *pouring* the *Spirit* upon them. John the baptist, (using the Greek language) says *baptize with water* and *baptize with the Holy Ghost;* refering no doubt as far as the application of the water was concerned to the same *act;* as well as to the same *influences of the divine Spirit.* And if, as we have seen, that that which in the prophecies is called *sprinkling* and *pouring*, is, in the New Testament language denominated *baptism;* the fact is clearly established by the Old and New Testament that that with which we are *baptized*, should be *poured* upon us; whether it be *water* or the *Spirit.*

An acknowledged rule of interpretation [Hedges logic rule 8th.] is, that words which admit of different senses, should be taken in their most common and obvious meaning, unless such a construction lead to absurd consequences, or be inconsistent with the known intention of the writer.

As we have, therefore, clearly ascertained the meaning of the word baptize, (as far at least, as the

mode of administering the ordinance is concerned;) to be that of *pouring out, shedding forth,* and *falling upon;* as this is not only the most *common* and *obvious meaning* of the word as used by the inspired writers of the Old, and of the New Testament, and as there is no word used by them to designate the act of baptism, or the mode of administering it, that does not have these meanings, we must necessarily (if we give conscience fair play,) arrive at the conclusion that although *one* meaning of the word in the *classic use,* may be to dip either *partially* or *wholly;* yet its *true,* and *only meaning* when used in reference to the *christian ordinance,* is *effusion,* by means of *pouring out, shedding forth,* and *falling upon.* The *classic* use of Greek terms is not to decide their meaning when used in a religious sense by the inspired writers of the New Testament. This is so obvious that A. C. in his preface to the third edition of the new version on the 11th page admits that "The seventy Hebrews who translated their own Scriptures into the Greek language, gave to that translation the idiom of their own vernacular tongue." He also says, "The *body* is Greek, but the *soul* is Hebrew; and, in effect, it comes to this, that, as we have no other Hebrew by which to understand the Hebrew Scriptures, but the Hebrew of the Old Testament; so we have no Greek by which to understand the apostolic writings—but the Greek

of the Jewish and Christian Prophets." It will therefore, be easily seen, that those who have adopted *immersion* as the mode of *baptism* because that is *one* of its meanings in the *classical use*, have only the *body* without the *soul*, while those who baptize by effusion give evidence that they have not lost the *soul;* that is, the meaning of the word as used by the inspired writers of the New Testament.

INTRODUCTION OF IMMERSION INTO THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

It may be thought strange by some, that immersion should have been introduced so soon after the death of the Apostles if that was not the mode in which they baptized. This, however, is easily accounted for. The opinion prevails to a considerable extent, that if a *little* is *good*, *more is better*. Hence the abuse of the Eucharist, or Lord's Supper; for which the Corinthians were so severely rebuked by Paul; they ate and drank to excess, thereby giving evidence that they did not discern the Lord's body. The Apostle enquires, "have ye not houses to eat and to drink in?" He accuses them also of becoming intoxicated, and tells them, "if any man hunger let him eat at home." And if they thus early abused one sacrament by eating and drinking to excess, because they thought that if a little was good more was better, we can easily see how they could err in reference to the quantity of water to be used in the ordinance of baptism, especially as they had learned that John baptized where there was much water, forgetting that there was nothing said in regard to the quantity used in administering the ordinance, and that

it would require more water to satisfy the wants of the multitudes that attended the ministry of John, than it would to immerse twice that number. If we must practice immersion because church history affords evidence that some were baptized in this mode in the second and third centuries; why not follow their example *fully*, and baptize naked? There is no historical fact better authenticated than that those who were immersed were divested of every particle of clothing. Dr. Wall says, "The ancient christians, when they were baptized by immersion, were ALL BAPTIZED NAKED, whether they were *men*, *women* or *children*." With this agrees the testimony of Dr. Miller, Stuart, and Robinson the baptist historian, and several others. Does not this circumstance give evidence that immersion originated from a superstitious notion in reference to that ordinance? We have further evidence of their bigotry and superstition from the conflicting opinions existing among them. Though the immersionists pretty generally agree in laying claim to infallibility, yet they cannot agree whether they should be immersed three times, or only once, whethe they should enter the water face foremost or backwards—whether they must be baptized to obey the command, or to follow the example of Christ—whether they should be baptized to represent the death, burial, or resurrection of Christ—whether baptism is a door into the church, or whether it must

be administered literally to wash away sins—whether they should be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; thereby dedicating themselves to the service of the *three* that bear record in heaven which *three are* ONE; or whether they should be baptized in the name of the Father, the great God and of the Son, the little, or inferior God, and of the Holy Ghost, an unintelligent agent, and consequently no God at all! All these conflicting opinions, with many others, are the common property of the immersionists. The Greeks practice immersion, and this is thought by some to be incontrovertible evidence in favor of that mode; but I ask why not follow them in all their foolish vagaries as well as in that particular? If right in one case why not in the others? But it is not conceded that in this matter the Greeks testify in their favor; they will not agree that *one* immersion is sufficient but it requires *three*, to constitute a valid baptism and consequently that our modern immersionists are only one third right; for if it requires *three immersions* to make *one baptism*, they must be immersed once and a half, to be *half* right. But this is not all!—The Greeks are not satisfied with their *trine immersion only*, but also practice effusion. We have clear evidence that they unite the *two modes*. They *dip* the candidate *three times*, and *sprinkle once;* thereby giving evidence that in their opinion, *one sprinkling*

is worth *three immersions!* But, say the advocates of immersion, "while we say that all are wrong but ourselves, many of those who practice effusion agree that immersion is baptism," and this induces them triumphantly to exclaim, "*we are safe in our baptism.*" To all such we would say, Not so fast! If you are not infallible you *may* be wrong, and if *wrong*, you are not only *sometimes wrong*, but *always wrong*. If immersion is not the correct mode you are *never right* because you practice *no other mode*. On the other hand, those who practice THREE MODES, *immersion, sprinkling* and *pouring*, will (if either is right,) most certainly be *sometimes right*; so that they have *three chances* to be *right* to your *one!*

INTRODUCTION OF IMMERSION INTO AMERICA.

To those who claim a succession of immersed believers from John the baptist to the present time and think that baptism though performed by immersion would not be valid without such a succession, let me ask, by what means was the first baptist church established in America? By consulting Benedict's History of the Baptists, vol. 1, page 475, and "A Glance at the Baptists by G. J. Miles, Pastor of the Baptist church, West Chester, Pennsylvania, page 118, we learn that the line of succession was then broken, if not a hundred times before. We here find it stated that there were twelve persons (not one of whom had been baptized by immersion) wishing to form a Baptist church, and instead of sending across the ocean for one of the regular succession, they appointed Ezekiel Holliman to immerse Mr. Williams; Mr. Williams then immersed Mr. Holliman, and the other ten. Here is the ground of their boasted succession. This circumstance occurred in Providence, Rhode Island, in the year 1639. Now if their position be correct that baptism administered by immersion is not valid unless the administrator had been baptized in that mode, *they* by this means

unchurch *themselves*, and all that descended from that stock, for if it be true as they say that a man cannot give that which he does not possess, then when Mr. Holliman immersed Roger Williams, Williams was still unbaptized, and consequently unqualified to administer the ordinance to others. And with all their boasting in reference to this matter, we very much doubt whether *one* in *ten* of the members of the Baptist churches can tell who *baptized* the *one* by whom *he* was *baptized*.

MISTAKE CORRECTED.

In a treatise on baptism written by Samuel Miller we have the following statement.

"Vote of the Westminster Assembly respecting Baptism."—"It has been sometimes ignorantly, and most erroneously asserted, that the Westminster assembly of divines, in putting to vote, whether baptism should be performed by *sprinkling* or *immersion*, carried in favor of *sprinkling*, by a majority of *one only*." This is wholly incorrect. The facts were these. When the committee who had been charged with preparing a "Directory for the worship of God," brought in their report, they had spoken of the mode of baptism thus: "*It is lawful and sufficient to sprinkle the child.*" To this Dr. Lightfoot, among others, objected; not because he doubted of the entire sufficiency of sprinkling; for he decidedly *preferred* sprinkling to immersion; but because he thought there was an impropriety in pronouncing that mode *lawful* only, when no one present had any doubts of its being so, and when almost all preferred it. Others seemed to think that by saying nothing about *dipping*, that mode was meant to be *excluded*, as *not* a *lawful* mode. This they did

not wish to pronounce. When, therefore the clause, as originally reported, was put to vote, there were twenty-five votes in favor of it, and twenty-four against it. After this vote, a motion was made and carried that it be *recommitted*. The next day, when the committee reported, and when some of the members seemed still unwilling to exclude all mention of dipping, Dr. Lightfoot remarked, that to say that *sprinkling* or *pouring* was lawful, would be "all one as saying, that it was lawful to use bread and wine in the Lord's Supper." He, therefore, moved that the clause in the "Directory" respecting the mode of baptism, be expressed thus: "Then the minister is to demand the name of the child, which being told him, he is to say (calling the child by name) I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and Holy Ghost." "As he pronounceth these words, he is to baptize the child with water, which for the manner of doing it, is not only *lawful* but *sufficient*, and *most expedient* to be, by pouring or sprinkling of the water on the face of the child, without adding any other ceremony." This was carried. See Dr. Lightfoot's life, prefixed to the first volume of his *works*, (folio edition,) § 4; compared with *Neal's history of the Puritans*, Vol. II, p. 106, 107, compared with the Appendix, No. II. (quarto edition) where the "Directory" as finally passed, is given at full length."

What now becomes of the assertion that the motion which was carried by a majority of one only, was, whether baptism should be administered by immersion or effusion? It will be readily seen that it is incorrect! The question was rather whether dipping, as the mode of baptism was at all admissible. And the first vote taken in which there was a majority of one, would have excluded all mention of dipping as a lawful mode of baptism. And after the matter was recommitted and a second report brought in, that which was finally adopted with great unanimity, was decisively in favor of baptism by effusion. It is therefore clearly seen that the statement of the immersionists in regard to this matter is an entire misrepresentation.

CLOSING REMARKS.

A remark has been made in this work in reference to the conflicting opinions held by the immersionists in regard to the design of baptism. We think it will not, and we are *sure* it *should not* be contended that a mistake in the mode, or external form of the ceremony of baptism, would be as likely to destroy its validity as a misapprehension of its design. It will not be denied that the Saviour had a particular design in instituting christian baptism. If the author of this institution, had no special design; why should it be instituted? In that case it most certainly would be an unmeaning ceremony, and we might be baptized to represent the building of Babel, the destruction of Jerusalem, or the discovery of America; or we might design *anything* or *nothing*, or even reject it altogether, as it might happen to suit our *fancy*. It being a settled point, then, that the Savior had a *design* in instituting the ordinance; we ask what is that *design?* Is it possible that it can be all that is contended for, by the 12 or 14 different sects that baptize only by immersion, and yet are so much at variance that they cannot sit together around one common board? Certainly not!

We shall not travel over the whole ground and examine all their notions in relation to this matter, some of them are so absurd that to mention them is a sufficient refutation. We shall, however, notice some of the most popular errors held by the immersionists. And here I must say though it gives pain to the writer, as well as to many of our readers that there is no doubt but that most of those who contend so strenuously against every mode but immersion, have erred so greatly upon this point, (even allowing them to administer in the right mode.) that it entirely destroys the validity of the ordinance, and leaves them *unbaptized*, in the proper sense of that institution. And there is no doubt in my mind but that the practice of immersion has a tendency to draw off the mind from the true import of christian baptism.—The regular baptist church though generally considered orthodox on other points, hold different, and even *opposite* views of the import of baptism, and cannot, therefore, be right as a body of people, and I have to say, though with great reluctance, that I never heard one of the members of that church (or indeed of any church that practices immersion exclusively) express anything like a scriptural view of that subject. It is true they do not err so greatly as to imagine that the cleansing efficacy or the pardoning power of the blood of Christ has been transfered to the water, such an error we believe would prove

fatal to their present and future well being, and we are truly glad they have not fallen into that error. This is one of the fundamental errors of Alex. Campbell. On the 220th page of Christianity Restored (so called) he says, "God has transferred, in some way, the whitening efficacy, or cleansing power, of water to blood; and the absolving or pardoning power of blood to water." He, however, endeavors to escape from the consequences of such a gross absurdity; for after stating that God "has now given the efficacy of blood to water," he adds, "this, as was said, is figurative;" but I ask what is a *figurative transfer*? a *figurative efficacy*? If there were only a *figurative transfer*, surely there could be no more than a *figurative pardon;* so that those who have been immersed for the remission of sins have only a *figurative remission*, and we fear their religion will in the end, prove to be more *figurative* than *real!* Another error into which many immersionists have fallen, is, that baptism is a sign or memorial of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. This view is taken by Alex. Campbell and fully expressed in his debate with McCalla page 273 and 274 and too many of almost all classes of immersionists have either preceded, or followed him in this matter. He says, "Bread and wine are not more suitable emblems of Christ's body and blood, used in the ordinance of the Supper, than baptism,

in its primitive administration, is of the *burial* and *resurrection* of Christ, and of our burial and resurrection with him by faith, and also of our literal burial and resurrection unto eternal life. The *answer of a good conscience* arising from baptism, not only implies that the subject of baptism should be a believer, but also has reference to the action of baptism. This answer of a good conscience arises from a knowledge of forgiveness and acceptance through the death and resurrection of Christ presented to our view in the action of baptism, as the Apostle Peter represents it, when declaring that baptism is the antitype of the deluge, or of the salvation of Noah by water." 1 Peter iii. 20, 21. Now if there had not been another ordinance instituted to represent the death of Christ we might believe that baptism was designed for that purpose; but even then it would be difficult to discover any analogy between the *death* of Christ upon the *cross*, and the *plunging* of a *live man* into the *water!* Paul says, 1 Cor. xi. 26. "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come."—But those whose views we now oppose will have it that as often as *baptism* is administered it presents to our view the death of Christ! We leave our opponents to settle this matter with the Apostle; and enquire whether baptism was instituted to represent the *burial* of Christ. The most zealous advocates

of immersion contend sharply for this view of the subject; but when asked for proof, they refer us to Rom. vi. 4. "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also should walk in newness of life." But I ask how it is known that this text has reference to water baptism? If it has reference to a literal burial, must it not also refer to a literal death? If Paul meant the burial of the body under water, why does he say "*we are buried?*" and especially why say we are buried *into death?* Was this death, the death of the body; effected by a physical burial? It must be, if by water baptism we are buried *into death?* Again, we ask, can it be thought that the burial of Christ in a sepulchre, hewn out of a rock, could be represented by dipping or plunging a person in the water? Could they not better represent the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, by first nailing a person to the cross,—then take him down—lay him into the earth, or water, suffer him to remain in that condition three days, and then let him rise by his own power; than by their method of *dipping in*, and *pulling* immediately *out?* Different nations, may indeed, differ much in regard to their method of *burying*, but I know of *none* who have the person that is to be *buried* walk into the grave knee deep or more, and thus partially bury *himself;* nor do I

know of any that bury by *dipping* instead of *pouring*, or that are in the habit of *pulling* them *out* as soon as they are *buried*. But it seems our immersionist friends have invented a new method of burying; but in so doing they have greatly erred not knowing the scriptures, and the power of God! Had they known these, they would have understood the *death*, *burial*, *planting*, *crucifixion* and *baptism* referred to by the Apostle to be of a *moral nature*, and effected by the *Spirit* of *God*, producing a death to sin, a burial; so that our life is hid with Christ in God, and a resurrection through the faith of the operation of *God* not of *man*, that we may walk in newness of life. Again, if baptism represents a *burial*, would it not as much represent the burial of the *three* that bear record in heaven, (when baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;) as the burial of *Christ?* But even supposing it did represent the burial of Christ, what good would such a representation do? Was Christ buried for our redemption? Did the mere burial of the Savior affect our salvation in any way? Are not the forgiveness of sins, and our salvation, ascribed to his *death* and *resurrection?* But we must close our remarks upon this point by a direct appeal to the declaration of the Savior in reference to this matter. Matth. xii. 39, 40, "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and

there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas: For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." The matter then is settled in regard to the sign of the burial of Christ, by the Savior himself. A sign has been given, but that sign is not *baptism*, it is the "sign of the prophet *Jonas*."—Now if the circumstances alluded to in the case of Jonas, was a *sign* of the burial of Christ, and no *other sign* was to be given, then those who are baptized to represent the burial of the Savior are evidently, and grossly deceived upon that point!

But it may be asked is not baptism a sign of the resurrection?

Does not our rising from the water represent a resurrection from the grave? As these questions are frequently asked I shall endeavor to have them answered, and if possible, so that there will be no occasion for asking them again. And first we must enquire what is baptism? For the present I shall be so accommodating as to allow our baptist friends to say what it is. With one accord they say "it is *immersion!*"

I next enquire, what is immersion? This is a hard question for those who contend that *immersion* and *baptism* are *synonymous terms.* But as hard as it *is*, it must be *answered;* and we are resolved to have a

correct answer! "It is, then, the *act* of *putting*, or the *state* of *being under water*." Well, how can this represent a resurrection? "Ah, there's the *difficulty*, we immersionists would like to have it mean to *take out*, as well as to *put in*." But are you not satisfied that *taking out*, is no part of the meaning of the word immerse? "We are not satisfied to have it so; *because* if it do not mean to take out, it cannot represent a resurrection; but we are certain that if we should assert that it *did*, every dictionary in the land would be against us!" I have another question to ask, it is this; how could a resurrection be represented by *pulling* a person out of the water even if that was a correct meaning of the word baptism? It must be seen at *once*, that there is no resemblance; and consequently those who have been baptized to represent the resurrection of Christ, have altogether mistaken views of the import of christian baptism.

Had the Prophets of the Old Testament, or any of the writers of the New, in any place referred us to the death, burial, or resurrection of Christ, in connection with water baptism, there would be some reason for believing baptism to be a sign of *one* or *all* of these, but as the matter now stands, we believe that to be baptized in that faith, is as *gross a perversion of a gospel ordinance*, as to partake of the Lord's Supper to represent the *baptism of the*

Holy Ghost !!! Some may be ready to enquire; "What then can be the import of baptism?" "Is it an unmeaning ceremony?" We answer, by no means! It has a meaning; and it is indeed, full of meaning when administered in the scriptural mode, and according to its original design. Its import is well expressed in the 16th article of our Confession of Faith, or Discipline; thus, "Baptism is not only a sign of profession, or mark of difference, whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized; but it is also a sign of regeneration, or the new birth." That baptism *with water* does represent the new birth or the regenerating influence of the Spirit is undeniable. At least it will not be denied except by those who disregard Scripture authority. In many passages of holy writ in the Old Testament as well as in the New, we have direct allusion to the subject now under consideration.—Hence we read in the language of prophecy: "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty—I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring." "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean from all your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you

to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do *them*." It must be seen at once that this can imply nothing less than the *new birth*, or those influences of the divine Spirit by which we are *regenerated* and brought into covenant relation to God. The same sentiment is clearly expressed in the New Testament language—"I baptize you with water—Christ shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." John's baptism differed as much from the christian baptism, as the faith of those who died before the coming of the Savior did from the christian's faith. *They* looked forward to the time in which salvation would be purchased for them and their children by the blood of Christ. Hence we read in the prophecy of Isaiah, of the Savior's soul being made an "offering for sin," and of his pouring "out his soul unto death," &c., and the Savior says:—"Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it, and was glad."—John viii. 56. In all those offerings under the Jewish law in which blood was shed, reference was had to the blood of Jesus Christ, without the shedding of which there is no remission.—And as *they* looked for a *coming* Savior, so *we* look back to the same *eventful* day when he "bare our sins in his own body on the tree."—1 Pet. ii. 24. When John baptized with water he required the people to believe on a coming Savior who would baptize with the Holy Ghost. When the Holy Ghost was

poured upon the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius, Peter enquires "can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, who have *received* the *Holy Ghost as well as* WE." As, then, the faith of the *Jew* under the law, differed somewhat from the *christians*, though it took hold of the *same object*, so *John's baptism* differs in several particulars from the *christian baptism*, yet it was designed as well as the christian to be emblematical of the purifying influences of the Spirit of God upon the soul, called in the language of prophecy the pouring out of the Spirit; and in the New Testament, the BAPTISM of the HOLY GHOST. Water baptism, then, being only of a *representative* character could no more save the soul from moral pollution, than the likeness of Washington could have saved our country!! We are aware that the advocates of the immersion theory will object to this view of the subject because it is not favorable to immersion. But who can believe that they would not claim the prophecies of the Old Testament, and the declarations of the New, as favoring their system if they presented one tenth part of the argument in favor of *immersion*, that they now do in favor of baptism by *effusion to represent the pouring out of the Holy Ghost.* When Paul says in Eph. iv. 4, 5. "*There is* one *body* and one *Spirit*, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism," he does

not intend to deny the baptism of the Spirit, (as many modern would be divines, have understood him), but intended to show that the only efficient baptism, is the baptism of the Holy Ghost, which changes our relation to God, engrafts us into Christ, which is by the Apostle called being "*baptized* into Christ;" and that water baptism is only designed to represent the baptism, or pouring out of the Holy Spirit. In Rom. ii. 28, 29, he says "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither *is that* circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: But he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision *is that* of the heart, in the spirit, *and* not in the letter; whose praise *is* not of men but of God."—We may, then, understand the Apostle; he is not a *christian*, which is one *outwardly;* neither is that *baptism*, which is *outward* in the *flesh:* but he is a *christian* which is one *inwardly;* and *baptism* is that of the *heart*, in the *spirit*, and not in the *letter;* whose praise is not of men but of *God!*—Thus we see that water baptism is designed to represent the baptism of the Holy Spirit, as much as circumcision in the flesh was designed to represent the circumcision of the heart. And just as sure as God intended that the circumcision of the heart should continue among his spiritual Israel; so sure did he intend that his children under the new dispensation should all be partakers of the *Holy Ghost.* Thus saith the Lord, "It shall come

to pass in the last days, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh." Joel ii. 28. Acts ii. 17. And with this agrees the testimony of Paul as recorded in 1st Cor. xii. 13. "For by *one Spirit* are we all baptized into one *body*, whether *we be* Jews or Gentiles, whether *we be* bond or free; and have all been made to drink into one *Spirit*." Thus it is seen that the Scriptures of eternal truth do not authorize the conclusion that the most essential, and only efficient baptism; the baptism of the Holy Spirit, was to be limited to a few of the first converts to christianity; for when Paul wrote to his Corinthian brethren he declares that he, and all that were in Christ were brought into that relation to him by baptism; and lest some should conclude that this was effected by *water* baptism, he says "by *one* SPIRIT *are we* ALL *baptized* into one body," and we have no reason to believe that *water baptism* can now effect that which in the days of the Apostles could be effected only by the *Spirit of God*. And I would now ask, What is the practical influence of immersion? Are those who most strenuously contend for that mode, better men—better christians than others? Are they more instrumental in the conversion of sinners? Do they contend more earnestly for the true faith of the gospel? Have they been more willing to lay down their lives for Christ's sake, than Luther, Calvin, Wesley, and a host of eminent gospel ministers,

whose belief, and practice were different from their own? Is immersion calculated to preserve doctrinal purity? If so, why do we find among immersionists, Antinomians, Arians, Socinians, Universalists, Campbellites, Millerites and Mormonites! Do immersionists possess a greater amount of christian charity than their neighbors? Are they willing to follow the advice of Paul, "Let a man examine himself, and so *let* him *eat*, and so *let* him *drink;*" or do *they* claim the right of examining their brother, and of saying, "*Let* him neither *eat* nor *drink*?"

Should any feel disposed to deny that such a state of things exists among immersionists; and that they are thus divided; I would refer them to a statement made by A. Campbell himself, in reference to this matter. It is found in Christianity restored, (falsely so called) on the 105th page. "And what shall I say of the 12, or 14, Sects of Baptists—many of whom have as much affection for the Greek or Roman church, as for one another." Here is an acknowledgement from one of the immersionists that there are 12, or 14, different *sects* of baptists, to which we may safely add his own; for as he does not acknowledge that those who follow his *ipse dixit* are a *sect*, but claim that they are the *whole church;* it is evident he does not include his followers in the heterogeneous mass! Perhaps they may think that this is best; as they have *heterodoxy* enough without

him; and *he certainly has enough of his own;* but in setting up this claim, and making this denial, he becomes more and more involved in the mazes of error!!

The doctrine of justification by faith established and defended against Alexander Campbell's views of the efficacy of water baptism.

There is nothing more clearly revealed in the sacred oracles than this; that man is a condemned criminal before God, and as such, stands in need of pardoning mercy. Consequently the doctrine of justification, pardon, or remission of sin, is of the utmost consequence to us, and forms one of the most prominent features of christian revelation. Such is its grand importance, that it spreads its influence throughout the whole body of divinity, and operates in every part of Christian experience and practical godliness. And as it would prove fatal to our interest both as it regards our present and future well being to err upon this point; it would be reasonable to suppose that the word of God would clearly point out the way and means of obtaining the remission of sin. This is undoubtedly the case; and the fact that there are different opinions existing in relation to that matter, argues not that there is any defect in the divine teachings, but on the contrary only proves the

ignorance and depravity of those to whom the revelation is made. Man, in his natural state has ever manifested a reluctance to submit to the divine teachings, an unwillingness to acknowledge his obligations to God, and his indebtedness to grace. And many having erred in regard to God's method of justifying sinners, have adopted a system of their own, unwarranted by the word of God, and entirely opposed to the gospel of Christ.

And as they seek justification upon those principles on which God will not justify, they must remain unjustified, and unpardoned, until they submit to God's righteousness.

The most common opinions in reference to justification are, that it is by *works* only; by *faith* only; or by faith and works united. We would call the attention of those who believe works to be the condition of pardon, or justification; to the following Scriptures. "By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified."—Gal. ii. 16. "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse."—Gal. iii. 10. "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight, for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now, the righteousness of God without the law is manifested." Rom. iii. 20, 21. "By Grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God. Not of works lest any man should boast."—

Eph. ii. 8, 9. "Not by works of righteonsness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us."—Titus iii. 5. "Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifyeth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness."—Rom. iv. 4, and 5. In all these passages it is unequivocally declared that our justification, or salvation from the guilt of sin is not by works. And the Apostle Paul gives a death blow to that system, when he declares "if by grace then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But *if it be* of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work."—Rom. xi. 6.

There is in the mind of some, an objection to Paul's doctrine of Justification, or salvation by grace, inasmuch as James tells us Abraham was justified, by works. We think however, that every person of discernment who will carefully examine the subject, will easily discover that James does not use the term Justification in the sense of pardon, (as Paul does,) but as a manifestation, or proof that he was justified; and he plainly avows his belief in the doctrine of justification by faith; in quoting, Gen. xv. 6. "Abraham believed God and it was imputed to him for righteousness."—James ii. 23. Yet he teaches that although faith is the principle upon which we are

justified; still we are to show our faith, that is, give evidence of the genuineness of our faith by our works; or in other words by rendering obedience to the divine requirements.

In reference to the sentiment that we obtain pardon of sin by faith and works united as the condition; we would remark, that if God had designed that man should be justified partly by grace, and partly by works, that we might glory in man, as well as in God, and in the cross of Christ: no doubt but that faith and works would have been united as the condition of justification or pardon; but in order to exclude boasting entirely from the christian system; he declares that pardon and salvation are obtained by grace, through faith,—not of works lest any man should boast. But some sophist may say that works cannot invalidate faith, so that if the condition prove to be faith only, that the addition of works is harmless. But I ask, is there no harm in pronouncing God's plan of salvation defective, and so improving it as to change entirely the ground of the sinner's acceptance with God, that boasting may not be excluded; for, "*to him that worketh, is the reward* not reckoned of grace but of debt." The sinner then, on this principle, claims salvation at the hand of God as his due; on which principle it cannot be granted. Again I ask is there no harm in making faith but a *part* of the condition, when God

designed it as the *whole*? Once more I ask if it can be right to consider works which are the fruits of justifying faith, and consequently only the evidence of it, as forming any part of the condition upon which our sins are pardoned?

And in conclusion, I would ask is there no harm in refusing to submit to God's righteousness, and in endeavoring to establish a righteousness of our own, contrary to the principles of the gospel? Let reason guided by the light of God's Spirit decide upon this subject. We have not the least particle of evidence that faith and works are united as the principle upon which our sins are pardoned.

That we may understand whether justification in the sense of pardon, is by faith only; we shall appeal from every other system of religion to the word of God.

Should we adduce all the proof the Scripture affords in reference to salvation by faith, we should be under the necessity of transcribing a very large portion of the New Testament. As this cannot be expected, we will select a few passages which relate to this subject. And here we would remark that whatever may be thought to be the meaning of Scripture, by those who reject the doctrine of justification by faith; this doctrine is as clearly and explicitly set forth in that book as language can make it. "Justified by faith," Rom. v. 1. "Live by faith," Hob-

bakkuk, ii. 4.—Rom. i. 17.—Gal. iii. 11.—Heb. x. 38 "purifying their hearts by faith," Acts xv. 9.—"Sanctified by faith," Acts xxvi. 18. "Saved through faith," Eph. ii. 8. "Seeing it is one God which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith," Rom. iii. 30. The Scriptures further declare; that God has opened the "door of faith to the Gentiles," Acts xiv. 27.—that the Scriptures are "able to make us wise unto salvation through faith," 2 Tim. iii. 15.—that we "receive the promise of the Spirit through faith," Gal. iii. xiv.—that we should "contend for the faith," Jude iii.—that we "overcome the world by faith," 1 John v. 4.—made whole by faith, Matth. ix. 22. Luke viii. 48. and xvii, 19. That Christ "dwells in our hearts by faith," Eph. iii. 17.—that we "stand by faith," Rom. xi. 20.—that we "walk by faith." 2 Cor. v, 7.—"Ye are all the children of God by faith," Gal. iii. 26.—"Kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation," 1 Pet. i. 5.—that we shall be "presented holy, and unblamable, and unreproveable if we continue in the faith, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel." Col. i. 23. See also 1 John v. 1.—John i. 12. John xx. 31.—John iii. 15, 16, 18, 36.—1 John v. 10, 13.—John xi. 25, 26.—Gen. xv, 6.—Rom. iv. 3.—Gal. iii. 6.—James ii. 23.—Acts xvi. 31.—Acts xviii. 39.—Acts x. 43.—1 Pet i. 9.—Rom. iii. 22, 25, 26, 28,

30.—Romans iv. 5.—Heb. xi. 4, 5, 6, 7.—But why should we adduce farther proof in reference to the subject of salvation by faith? Those we have given are clear, and full to the point: and the reader is requested to examine every one of them, and then say if any one of the fifty passages does not prove that there is a saving power ascribed to faith in the christian system. This is not all, those passages adduced are but a small portion found in the word of God. Not only do the Scriptures declare that those who "believe are justified," but they condemn all unbelievers. He that believeth not is condemned already." John iii. 18.—"He that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." John iii. 36. "He that believeth not shall be damned." Mark xvi. 16.—"Without faith it is impossible to please *God*." Heb xi. 6. "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Rom. xiv. 23. Yet with all this weight of testimony there are those who deny the power of faith, and claim justification on an entire different principle. Thus Alexander Campbell says in "Christian system" page 238. "It is not our faith in God's promise of remission, but our going down into the water that obtains the remission of sins." The reader, we presume, will see at once, that the man who declares this, has set himself in array against a multitude of inspired writers; and was it not that he professes to derive his sentiments from

the Scriptures, and by this means deceives the simple, many of them are too absurd; and too manifestly opposed to the testimony of the Sacred Oracles, to require a serious refutation. But as he has succeeded in making assertion pass for proof and thereby deluded many unwary, and unstable souls, who tamely submit to follow his ipse dixit instead of taking the word of God for their guide in matters of religion, we feel disposed to turn our attention for a short time to one feature of this gospel which is, in all its essential characteristics, so manifestly opposed to the gospel of Christ. Not only does this champion of water regeneration, contradict the inspired writers of the New Testament, but he also contradicts the experience of every living christian. That Alexander Campbell is destitute of the christian's faith, and unacquainted with the christian's hope, is evident from his own declaration. He says in his book, entitled "Christianity Restored," page 240, "we know so much of human nature as to say, that he, that imagines himself pardoned, will feel as happy as he that is really so." Here it will be seen most clearly, that he does not believe that the child of God who has received the pardon of his sins,—is made a partaker of justifying grace, and been adopted into the family of God, has any greater enjoyment than the man who is vainly puffed up in his fleshly mind, and imagines himself pardoned and

accepted of God while he is a child of the Devil, *in* the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity. What is this but saying that the christian has no communion, or fellowship with God? It is quite probable that those who seek to be justified by baptism, or any other work of their own, as the condition of pardon will embrace Mr. C's. views of this matter because their experience will coincide with his. Neither *he*, nor *they*, however, have attained to righteousness, because they sought it not by faith; but going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God. Rom. ix. 32, and x. 3. Mr. C. after saying that he that imagines himself pardoned will feel as happy as he that is really so, immediately adds, "But one thing we do know, that none can rationally, and with certainty, enjoy the peace of God, and the hope of heaven, but they who intelligently, and in full faith are born of water, or immersed for the remission of their sins. And as the testimony of God, and not conceit, imagination, nor our reasoning upon what passes in our minds, is the ground of our certainty, we see and feel, that we have an assurance which they cannot have." Now we are willing to admit that the ground of certainty in relation to the remission of our sins, is not conceit, or imagination; but we cannot admit that our reasoning upon what passes upon our bodies, instead of that which passes upon our minds, is the

ground of that certainty. We have a more sure word of prophecy which declares that "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself."—1 John v. 10. Now if it said, he that believeth in the water, hath the witness in the water; it certainly would have given countenance to that system which teaches that without water there is no remission; but if the word of God be true, believers have the witness in themselves, and consequently not in rivers, ponds, or lakes, the assertion of certain self styled reformers to the contrary notwithstanding.—Paul tells us, Romans v. 1 and 6 inclusive, "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also; knowing that tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience, and experience hope, and hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." There is nothing more certain than that Campbell and Paul are at varience, for while one says, that, "he that imagines himself pardoned will feel as happy as he that is really so," the other declares that he who is justified by faith, has peace with God—That he rejoices in the hope of the Glory of God, and that the love of God is shed abroad in his heart.

by the Holy Ghost. Now if the christian can be justified and possess this peace, and hope, and love, without enjoying any greater degree of happiness than the man that only imagines himself pardoned, while the wrath of God abides upon him, then the system of salvation by water as taught by C. is by no means inferior to the system of salvation by faith, as taught by Paul and all other inspired writers of the sacred oracles. While one is justified by faith, he has peace with God, and war with Mr. C. The one that seeks to be justified by works, especially water work, has peace with Mr. C. and is at enmity with God, "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse."—Gal. iii. 10. Is it not strange that a man professing to be a disciple of Christ, to believe the bible, and especially professing to have no creed but it, should use language not only *different* from the word of God but in all its essential characteristics *directly opposed* to it. That the two systems are at war with each other, cannot with any degree of consistency be denied by those who have examined both. Mr. Campbell teaches that the man that deceives himself, and only imagines himself pardoned, will feel as happy as the real child of God whose sins have been forgiven. The Scriptures teach that there is no peace to the wicked, but that the christian enjoys peace with God, even that peace which passeth all understanding. One teaching that

there is no difference in their religious enjoyments, the other that there *is*. The Scriptures declare "that we are justified *by faith*." "All that believe *are* justified." "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God." "Whosoever believeth in him shall receive the remission of sins." Mr. C. says, "that it is not faith, but an act resulting from faith, which changes our state." "It is not our faith in God's promise of remission, but our going down into the water that obtains the remission of sins."—One declares it is faith, the other, that it is not.—Mr. C. teaches that there are no means of turning to God but by immersion. Christianity restored page 215. "All is mental and invisible before coming out of the water: and as immersion is the first act commanded, and the first constitutional act; so it was in the commission, *the act* by which the Apostles were commanded to turn, or convert those to God, who believed their testimony. In *this* sense then, it is the converting act. No man can, scripturally, be said to to be converted to God until he is immersed." Again page 214. "Immersion *alone* was that act of turning to God." The intelligent reader will at once see that the ground Mr. C. has here taken, is directly opposed to the word of God. Not only does he declare an untruth in saying immersion is the *first* act commanded; but in saying that it was ever in the scriptures commanded at all. The word immer-

sion is not to be found in the original scriptures, in the common English Bible; nor in any fair translation from the Greek in reference to the ordinance of baptism. Nor can it be proved that in a correct translation there is any word used in reference to the christian baptism corresponding in sense with that of immersion. This remark is made in relation to the act, or mode of baptism. It is true we are said to be "buried by baptism into death;" "baptized into Christ;" "by one spirit to be baptized into one body." This however relates to the union existing between Christ and the members of his mystical body, and not at all to the act or mode of baptism, which was always by pouring. And as it relates to the mode or manner of burying it certainly is not dipping or plunging, but pouring; so that whatever view we take of the subject, every circumstance proves that that, with which we are baptized is poured upon, and falls upon us. And this is not all. He is not only mistaken in regard to the mode of baptism, and its being the first act commanded, but also in relation to its being the only act of turning to God. It is clear that either Christ or Paul, or Campbell is in an error upon that point. Let us see. In the 26 chapter of Acts, we learn that Christ sent Paul to the Gentiles, "to open their eyes, and to *turn* them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sin, and inheritance

among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me." This is the language of our Savior. Mr. C. says, "immersion *alone* is the act of turning to God." "Immersion is the act by which the Apostles were commanded to turn or convert to God." "No person was said to be converted or turn to God, until he was buried in, and raised up out of the water." We have now learned that Paul was sent by Christ to turn the people to God. Mr. C. teaches that there are no means by which they can be converted, or turned to God but *baptism*. We are ready to hear Paul's testimony upon this subject. 1. Cor. i. xiv. xv. xvi. xvii. "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gains; lest any should say that I had baptized in my own name. And I baptized also the household of Stephanus; besides, I know not whether I baptized any other. For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." Here we have the evidence, 1st That Paul was sent to turn the people to God. 2nd. That he was not sent to baptize them. 3d. The testimony of Campbell, that it is only in that act, that they can be turned to God. Reader which of these witnesses will you believe? Christ our redeemer and Paul the Apostles of the Gentiles; or Alexander Campbell the self-styled reformer, and apostle of baptismal regeneration? It is now seen, that there is a manifest contradiction between Alexander's gospel, and the gospel of Christ. But that

the absurdity of his views may be seen we will persue the subject a little further. It will be borne in mind by the reader, that Mr. C. uses the expression "turn to God" as being synonymous with baptism; and that synonymous terms may with the strictest propriety be used in the place of each other. Let us see whether these terms are of the same import. Paul. "I thank God that I baptized (*turned to God*) none of you but Crispus and Gaius: Lest any should say that I baptized (*turned to God*) in my own name.—And I baptized (*turned to God*) also the household of Stephanas; besides I know not whether I baptized (*turned to God*) any other. For Christ sent me not to baptize (*turn to God.*) but to preach the gospel." Now it is certain that there were other means of turning to God than that of baptism; or Paul was thankful to God, that he was no more successful in the work his master had assigned him. How unlike the language of Paul, is that of the disciples of Mr. C. While he thanks God for the smallness of the number he baptized at Corinth, they are boasting, and publishing throughout the length and breadth of the land their success in this matter.

I will give a specimen from a Millennial Harbinger, now before me, No. 10. Vol. 4. 1833, the following language occurs:—"nine of whom I immersed into the name of the Lord Jesus for the remission of their sins, within the last six weeks."

"I seldom fail going into the river twice a week."

"Some have the moral courage to come out boldly and confess the good confession, and be immersed for the remission of their sins."

"Immersed these and ten others for the remission of sins."

"Since my last communication to you, I have baptized and received into membership upwards of fifty persons." "Sixteen persons confessed the Lord, and were immersed into his name." "We immersed seventeen for remission,"—"about twenty were immersed,"—"thirty three were immersed." "A bath of water was prepared near the bed, in which I immersed her." "Knowing that you are at all times truly gratified at hearing the progress of the ancient gospel, I now take the pleasure and liberty to inform you of the success it has met with in our section of the country. On Saturday and Sunday, the 24th and 25th days of August last, brother John Steele visited us, and before he left nineteen confessed the Lord and were immersed for the remission of sins." "The next week I went to Nashville, where I had the happiness of seeing nineteen buried." I suppose if he meant buried in water, and they buried them alive, he staid until they took them out again, so that they could not say with Paul we *are* buried. And if they were buried in *water*, it was essentially

different from that mentioned by Paul, for Paul says they were buried into *death*. If any one thinks that such language can be found in the word of God, I would be glad to have him inform me in what part of the Scriptures it is contained; that it may be seen that they have at least one article of their faith derived from the bible! What a cloud of witnesses we here have for water regeneration, yet we have in all these conversions no account of repentance toward God, or faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. Nothing of believing with the heart unto righteousness, or of being justified by faith, and we fear as they sought justification by works, they attained not to it, because they sought it not by faith.

Well may Mr. C. teach *his disciples*, that he that imagines himself pardoned will be as happy as he that is really so! We have no doubt but that such an one will enjoy as much of the peace of God, as any one that seeks justification or pardon on his principles; or any other than that of faith as taught in the sacred oracles.

While we are on the subject of difference between the two systems of salvation, we will call the readers attention to the following declaration, page 280, "Christianity restored." "When we speak in the style of the living oracles on this subject, we must represent being born again, (John iii. 5,) and regeneration (Titus iii. 5,) as relating to the act of immer-

sion alone." We have already seen his error in believing that turning to God, and immersion are equivolent, we will now try *these* terms by the same rule. "Then cometh Jesus from Gallilee to Jordan, unto John, to be baptized (*regenerated*, or born again) of him." "I thank God I baptized (*regenerated*) none of you but Crispus and Gaius,—And I baptized (*regenerated*) also the household of Stephanas, and besides I know not whether I baptized, (*regenerated*) any other. For Christ sent me not to baptize (*regenerate*) but to preach the gospel."

Again page 205, he tells us, "*All must admit, that no person can be born again of that which he receives.*" Now if this be true, then we either do not receive the Spirit, or we are not born of the Spirit. That a man cannot enter the kingdom of heaven without being born of the Spirit, the Savior declares in John iii. 5. If Campbellism be true, then we cannot receive the Spirit. Therefore when Peter promised, Acts ii. 38, that they should receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, he promised what they could not receive. When Peter and John laid their hands on the Samaritans, and prayed that they might receive the Holy Ghost, Acts viii. 15, 17. their prayers were not heard; otherwise Campbellism would not be true.

Again we are said to be born of God John i. 13. "every one that loveth is born of God." 1 John iv.

7. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." 1 John v. 1. We learn from Matthew x. 40. that those that received the disciples of Christ, received Christ, and in receiving Christ they received him that sent him. In the third chapter of Eph. we learn that Paul prayed that they might be filled with all the fullness of God. Now if Mr. Campbell's views are correct that no man can be born of that which he receives; then the Christian cannot receive God, or he cannot be born of God.

On the 238th page of C. R. He informs us that faith "brings us to the water, to Christ, and to heaven." Here he certainly ascribes more to faith than the word of God will warrant, for the Scripture no where declare that faith will take a man to the water. It is generally supposed that it requires physical strength to take a man to the water; and it certainly does, in those cases where building dams is necessary. But let us enquire for what purpose faith brings us to the water? On p. 238 he says "it is not our faith in God's promise of remission, but our going down into the water that obtains the remission of sins." On the 137th page of his debate with McCalla he tells us that the baptized believer rises out of the water as "innocent, as clean, as unspotted as an angel." On the 243 page of C. R. he says, "Down into the water you were led." "There

your consciences were released; for there your old sins were washed away." Paul must have been very unfortunate, for he and Mr. C. do not appear to agree in any one article of their creed. Paul says, "The law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ that we might be justified by faith," Gal. iii. 24.

"All that believe are justified." "To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly his faith is counted *for* righteousness," Rom. iv. 5. In Rom. iii. 30 he also says, "Seeing it is one God which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith." Mr. C. says it is not faith that obtains the remission of sins, but our going down into the water. Nor does Peter, or any of the prophets fare better in this respect than Paul. If Campbell's testimony is to be received as truth, Peter as well as Paul stands convicted of falsehood and heresy, for he says Acts x. 43, "To him give all the prophets witness that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins."

Christianity restored page 220, Mr. Campbell makes the following decleration. "There are two things equally incomprehensible—to wash garments *white* in blood, and to *wash away* sins in water!—An efficacy is ascribed to water which it does not possess; and as certainly, an efficacy is ascribed to

blood which it does not possess. If blood can *whiten* or cleanse garments, certainly water can *wash away* sins. There is, then, a transfering of the efficacy of blood to water; and a transfering of the efficacy of water to blood. This is a plain solution of the whole matter. God has transfered in some way the whitening efficacy, or cleansing power, of water, to blood; and the absolving or pardoning power of blood to water.

This is done upon the same principle as that of accounting faith for righteousness. What a gracious institution! God has opened a fountain for sin, for moral pollution. He has given it an extension far and wide as sin has spread—far and wide as water flows. Wherever water, faith, and the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are, there, (that is in the water) will be found the efficacy of the blood of Jesus. Yes; as God first gave the efficacy of water to blood, he has now given the efficacy of blood to water. This, as was said, is figurative; but it is not a figure that misleads, for the meaning is given without a figure, viz: immersion for the remission of sins." Mr. C. is by some considered a great man, and if we allow that committing great blunders constitutes greatness, he is certainly the greatest man living except *Joe Smith;* and if the man that commits the greatest error is the greatest man; the champion of the Latter Day Saints will undoubtedly

have to yield the palm to the champion and advocate of water regeneration. For although they agree in rejecting Jesus Christ as the chief corner stone; and make *water* the *sine qua non* in their system of salvation; yet I do not know that Joe Smith ever said that the absolving or pardoning power of blood was transferred to water. If the sentiment be true that the efficacy of the blood of Christ is transferred to the water; the information John received concerning the multitude which no man could number, was not correct; because they were said to have "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." Rev. vii. 14. John says, "If we walk in the light, as he is in the light we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin." 1 John i. 7. Here we discover the difference between the new gospel and the gospel of Christ; and it is to be feared that those who believe that the blood of Christ has lost all its efficacy by having it transferred to water; will never say with John; "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion forever and ever." Rev. i. 5, 6. Well may he commend this system of salvation by water, and say, "What a gracious institution!" Yes it is quite gracious! But there is not so much of the grace of God in it, as there is of

the grace of Alexander Campbell. For while the *grace of God* was manifested—in opening "*the door of* FAITH to the gentiles." Acts xiv. 27. Mr. C. has manifested *his grace* by shutting the door of *faith*, and opening a *back* door, and letting us into the kingdom by *immersion*. Paul teaches that our salvation "is of faith that *it might be* by Grace." Rom. iv. 16. But *he* teaches that it is not faith that obtains the blessing, but our going down into the water.—What a pity he did not tell us what depth the water must be, and how far into the water we must go, to procure our pardon. Perhaps it would be well for some of his disciples to enquire of him, whether the water must be ankle deep, knee deep, or whether crossing the street in a rainy day will secure the blessing of *his* justifying grace. It is likely however, that they would not trust us unless some of them could go with us into the water, for their system teaches that God cannot pardon a penitent believer out of the water, and even should he stand in the water, for weeks, and months, he would still be an unpardoned sinner; but let some one of these disciples plunge him under the water, he would then rise out of the water "as innocent, as clean, as unspotted, as an angel." A gracious institution truly! But very different from that taught in the word of God! Yet he professes to have no creed but the bible.—And finding that he could not sustain his favorite

theory by the revelation given us, he has made a revelation of his own. In his preface to Christianity Restored on the 12th page, he informs us that in illustration and defence of these principles, "beside our debates of 1820,–23, and 29, four editions of the new version of the New Testament, with prefaces, various tables, notes, criticisms, &c.; there have issued from our press twelve volumes." All this gentle reader in illustrating and defending those principles which cannot be sustained by any fair translation of the Scriptures. Beside his twelve volumes, and debates, he has published four editions of the new version of the New Testament; but not without prefaces,—notes, criticisms, and various emendations. He would fain make us believe,—at least the course pursued by him has caused many of his followers to believe that the word immersion, which he has substituted for baptism, is so rendered in the translation of George Campbell, McKnight, and Doddridge. This however, will prove a complete failure, except in those cases in which the people will not take pains to examine for themselves. He has taken upon himself the responsibility of substituting immersion for baptism, whenever it relates to the christian ordinance. This is one of his own emendations for which he has no example in any fair translation of the Sacred Oracles. He has, in his translation, immerse, or immersion, above sixty times, and in his

other publications, perhaps more than forty thousand times, yet it is never found in the original Scriptures; nor is it once found in any correct translation of the word of God. In the course pursued by him in this matter, we have the most conclusive evidence, that the system he advocates and the articles of faith he has so long labored to sustain, have no countenance from the word of God. But as there are a few passages of Scripture, which are supposed by some to favor his views of baptism for remission; we will carefully examine these texts, for if they contain evidence of the truth of his doctrine we are as much interested in it as any one can be. Before we proceed however, to the examination of the Scriptures upon this point, we would notify the reader, that the literal reading of some one or two isolated texts, or detached sentences will not authorize us to embrace a doctrine that is opposed to a multitude of plain declarations of the word of God. And wherever there is a seeming contradiction the smaller number, or the more obscure, should yield to, and be illustrated by the more numerous and plainer ones. This being premised, we proceed to show that those texts so much relied upon to sustain the superstitious papal notion of water regeneration, do not give the least countenance to that dangerous error.—The first to which we call the readers attention, and the one chiefly relied upon to prove that remission of sins

cannot be obtained without water baptism, is found in Acts ii. 38. "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." "Be baptized *for* the remission of sins," is the expression upon which they found their argument in favor of that system. We would remark that the preposition here rendered *for*, is a word of doubtful meaning, and has, in the original, above twenty different meanings. Perhaps some of our readers will be surprised to learn that the word here translated *for*, is *eis;* the same word so much relied upon to prove that Philip and the Eunuch went *into* the water.—No doubt but our opponents would contend very sharply against having it translated *for*, in that case; because it would then read they "both went down *for* the water and he baptized him," which would have nearly ruined their favorite theory of immersion! We cannot ascertain with certainty what the rendering should have been in this particular instance; but we may venture to affirm that we should not attempt to establish an important point in theology by a word of such doubtful meaning. The same word occurs in the original in Matthew iii. 11, which in our translation is rendered unto, "I baptize you with water (*eis*) unto repentance," yet we presume no individual would contend that baptism was the means of repentance, and

that no man could repent until he was baptized.

We read Mark i. 4. "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance (*eis*) for the remission of sins;" *eis*, is the word here rendered *for;* and in Matthew iii. 11, it is rendered *unto.* Now if the language of Peter, "be baptized (*eis*) for the remission of sins," proves the impossibility of receiving remission, by any other means in Peter's day, the language of Mark concerning John's preaching "the baptism of repentance (*eis*) for the remission of sins," proves that remission of sins could not be obtained in John's day without baptism; and when John says "I baptize you with water (*eis*) unto repentance" he must mean that they could not *repent* without baptism. It is easily seen that this view of the subject involves our opponents in the greatest difficulties imaginable, for it is certain that John required repentance before baptism, yet he used the same word in reference to repentance, that Peter does in reference to remission of sins, so that if John meant to be understood that they must repent before baptism; then Peter meant that his hearers must receive *remission* of *sins* before *baptism*; And if Peter meant that they could not receive *remission* of *sins* without *baptism;* John meant that they could not *repent* without *baptism.* Certainly the advocates of that system which teaches that there is no salvation without baptism will feel themselves to

be stranded here. Again we might prove some of the greatest absurdities imaginable by taking certain detached sentences according to their literal meaning. For example take the following, "He shall cover thee with his fathers, and under his wings shalt thou trust." Ps. xci. 4. "The ten horns are ten kings" Dan. vii. 24. "This is my body," "This is my blood." Matt. xxvi: 26, 28. "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup," 1. Cor. xi. 26. "Be baptized for the remission of sins." We suppose it will hardly be contended that all these are to be understood literally, though we once conversed with an advocate of this theory, who said that every passage of Scripture was to be understood just as it read.

I then enquired if he understood the following texts precisely as they read, "the proud, and all that do wickedly *shall be stubble*"—"if thy *right hand offend thee cut it off;*" He that believeth on me *out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.*" He readily answered yes. I asked, if from the expression, "He shall cover thee *with his feathers;*" he understood that the Lord was a *feathered animal.* He hesitatingly answered yes; I would rather believe *that*, than agree that the Scriptures do not mean *what they say.* I told him I would present *one more*, and if he could swallow *that*, he could find no difficulty in swallowing the whole camel. "As often as

ye eat this bread, and drink this cup;" now sir, said I, if you will swallow the cup you need have no fears of ever being choked. He shrunk from the task; and the probability is, if he has any degree of moral honesty, and a proper share of common sense, he will avoid such undertakings for the future. This took place in Richland county, Ohio; the name of the man with whom I contended this point was Smith; who on the self same day immersed two females to wash away their sins! Reader do you recollect that Paul makes the following declaration? "For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sins, lead away with divers lusts; ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth."—2 Tim. iii. 6, 7. He further tells us these men "resist the truth," and that they are "reprobate concerning the faith;" evidently referring to those that reject the truth of the Bible in saying, "It is not our *faith* in God's promise of remission, but our going down *into* the *water* that obtains the remission of sins." Well might he pronounce them reprobate concerning the *faith*, inasmuch as they declare that "immersion *alone* is the act of turning to God." Now if it be contended that to "be baptized for the remission of sins" must mean what it literally says, on the same principle it may be contended that the Lord has wings and feathers; that a certain nation (instead of men) had horns

for their kings; that the bread and wine, are the body and blood of our Savior, and that in commemorating his death we should actually and literally, drink the cup. It may be said that A. Campbell never said in plain terms that every passage should be understood literally. Perhaps he did not; but if he only gave a hint that it was so, this was enough to induce many of his admirers to feel anxious to be the first to proclaim it. That he *does more* than *intimate* that the Scriptures are to be understood literally, we learn from the following language. Christianity Restored, page 223. "It is no wonder that many sectaries cannot be persuaded to think that the Scriptures mean what they say; for they are so much accustomed to say what they do not mean, that they can not think God does mean what he says." This is enough! New light has now burst upon their enraptured vision! Sectarians must now tremble before the dread armies of Alexander the Great; because they do not believe that every passage of Scripture literally means what it literally says. Is it any wonder that such people should dislike to be called his followers when they frequently get so far ahead of him as to be almost out of sight? They sometimes find, however, that in getting so far ahead of him they get in the dark, become bewildered, and have to go back to him and enquire the way; for notwithstanding he has written so many volumes to

explain what he tells them is so plain that they cannot be misunderstood, they find themselves very frequently enshrouded in midnight darkness. To aid them in this particular he has published four editions of a new translation of the Testament; for as they have adopted the theory that the Scriptures mean what they say, and as they well knew that they did not sustain Campbellism; they must have one that would say what they would like to have it mean.—But they have their difficulties after all; for the inspired writers tell us, we "live by faith," "stand by faith," "walk by faith," are "justified by faith," "purified by faith;" and that we are "sanctified by faith." These passages however, they will tell us, do not mean what they say; because that would utterly demolish their whole system. Now had the Scripture said, we live by baptism, stand by baptism, walk by baptism, justified by baptism, purified by baptism, and that we are sanctified by baptism; it would all be right in their view, and would mean just what it said; with this exception however, that they must be allowed to substitute immersion for baptism. Had the Scriptures said we live by immersion, are justified by immersion, &c., the world would not have been favored with Mr. C's. new translation of the Bible. We are aware that it is denied that A. C. is the author of the new version, but in the Millennial Harbinger, No. II, Vol. II, p. 94, he says, "the new

version is as much *my* translation, as the common version is the translation of King James' 47 Divines."

Again, there is every reason to believe that repentance is more closely connected with the promise of remission than baptism, because repentance necessarily precedes that faith which justifies. The Savior says, "except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish." Paul tells us, that God, "Commandeth all men every where to repent."—Acts xvii. 30. And Rom. ii. 5, that the impenitent are treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath.

It is true, that a belief in the existence and benevolence of God, goes before repentance; for, "he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of those that diligently seek him."—Heb. xi. 6. "The goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance."—Rom. ii. 4 But it is evident that many believe this, who do not repent, and consequently perish, it is only those who repent that are enabled to believe with the heart unto righteousness, and none but those who exercise this faith are justified. In this sense then, repentance is necessary, inasmuch as without it no man can believe to the saving of the soul. It is no where said, except ye be baptized ye shall all likewise perish! God commandeth all men every where to be baptized!

The unbaptized are treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath! They were not baptized that

they might believe! yet all this is said of *repentance* which gives evidence that repentance bears a relation to that faith which justifies, that baptism does not; and is more closely connected with forgiveness or remission of sins, than baptism, or any other external work performed by man. Indeed Peter, in placing repentance first, makes it of the greatest importance, and the Savior himself, considered the act of baptism as having so little to do with remission, that in giving the instruction (as recorded by Luke chap. xxiv. 46, 47.) leaves it entirely out of the account. Hear his language. "Thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." It is certain that the Savior in the use of this language, gave no countenance to the sentiment that baptism *alone* was the act of turning to God, or that it formed any part of the condition of pardon! But we do not wish to be understood that Peter misapprehended the Savior; we believe he understood the principle upon which they were justified, far better than those whose principles we oppose have understood his language. We shall now appeal to Peter for an explanation of his own words, and every true christian will be thankful to God for the explanation given. This is recorded in Acts xv. 7, 8, 9. "Men and brethren ye know

how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God which knoweth the hearts bear them witness giving them the Holy Ghost even as he did unto us; And put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith." Here we have a full exposition of Peter's creed upon this point. He tells us that God had made choice of him that the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel and believe. Mark, he says they were to *hear* and *believe*. And God which knoweth the hearts bear them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost even as he did unto us; recollect, it was not because they were baptized, but because of the state of their hearts. "And put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith." Alas for Campbellism! If Peter believed baptism was the condition of pardon on the day of Pentecost, he has certainly changed his opinion and embraced orthodoxy. "But Peter, how dare you say that you *preached the gospel* to them, when you said not one word to them about being baptized for remission of sin; and especially how dare you *say*: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, Whosoever *believeth* in him shall receive remission of sins? Why did you wait until they were converted and received the Holy Ghost before you baptized them? And will you say too, that their *hearts*

were purified by faith? Did you not know that it was not *faith*, but going down into the WATER that obtains the remission of sin? Well, if you will have it that the *Gentiles* were purified by faith, will you not allow that the *Jews* were justified upon another principle, and that *baptism* was the condition of pardon to them?" No! He put no difference between *us* and *them;* for if one were justified by *faith*, and the other by *baptism*, there would have been a vast difference between us, God would be a repecter of persons; and moreover Paul would be convicted of heresy, for he says, "Seeing it is one God which shall justify the *circumcision by faith* and the *uncircumcision through faith.* And beside Paul has told us plainly that God has opened the DOOR of FAITH to the *Gentiles*, so that however much it might gratify *you*, I shall not open a *back door* and let you in *through baptism.* Whatever then, you may think of the efficacy of baptism, I shall agree with Paul, that "God hath set forth Jesus Christ as a propitiation through faith in his blood to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past—that he might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." Rom. iii. 25, 26.—Thus it is seen, that Peter is truly orthodox; a firm believer in the doctrine of justification by faith, and not at all afraid to declare that all the prophets bear testimony to this truth that whosoever believeth in

Jesus shall receive remission of sins. That repentance should be considered as having a close connection with their salvation is evident not only from the reasons before given, but in the 11th chapter of Acts 17, 18 verses it is said, "God gave them the like gift as he did unto us, who *believed* on the Lord Jesus Christ." "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance (*eis*) unto life." Here is a death blow to Campbellism! Here we are informed that it was *repentance*, and not *baptism* that was (*eis*) unto, or for life. All is here ascribed to repentance, that was before ascribed to both. Repentance has the same connection with life, that it had with the remission of sins; the same word connects them, and the Jews themselves understood that the *repentance* was the condition of life or remission; and not the *baptism*, for they say, "Then hath God *also*, (that is to the one, as well as to the other,) granted *repentance* (*eis*) unto (or for) *life*. It is the same word in the Greek, and has the same meaning; if one was *for* remission, so was the other, if one was *unto* remission so was the other. Again Peter tells us, Acts .v 31. "Him hath God exalted with his right hand *to be* a prince and a Savior, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins." Here is indubitable testimony that repentance was of more avail in procuring forgiveness, than baptism. Had Peter said to give baptism and forgiveness to

Israel; and in the other case had it read then hath God also to the Gentiles granted baptism unto life. If the Savior had said, There is joy in heaven among the angels over one sinner that is baptized. If Paul had said Godly sorrow worketh baptism (eis) unto salvation not to be repented of, 2 Cor. vii. 10 instead of "repentance and forgiveness," "repentance unto life," and "repentance to salvation," Campbellism might have had some chance for its life, but it has now, none at all, unless it should be the beast that lived after receiving the deadly wound. We hope it will not be forgotten that it is the same word (eis) that is used in all the before mentioned places. God hath "granted *repentance* (eis) unto life." "Godly sorrow worketh *repentance* (eis) to salvation." ***Repent*** and be baptized (eis) for the remission of sins. This word (eis) might have been rendered *for* in all these cases as well as in one. Then we should read granted repentance *for* life, repentance *for* salvation; to give *repentance* to Israel and remission of sins. Repentance then is a condition not for which, but without which no man can be saved, because the impenitent heart is wholly unprepared to exercise that faith which unites us to Christ, and is called believing with the heart (eis) unto righteousness. It is said of some they repented not that they might believe. Hence repentance, and not baptism was for remission.

This was clearly expressed by the Savior, "*Repentance* and *remission* of sins was to be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem." There it did begin, there repentance and remission, or repentance for remission was preached; they *repented* and *believed*, their hearts were *purified by faith;* Peter says God gave them the like gift as he did unto us who *believed*,"—"what was I, that I could withstand God?" How much better would it be, if our Campbellite friends would be as submissive to Peter, as were the Jews; and confess that it was not *baptism* but *repentance* that God had granted (eis) unto or for life, they could then, with Paul, "testify both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, *repentance* toward God, and *faith* toward our Lord Jesus Christ," Acts xx. 21, and say with him, "all that *believe are justified.*" They would have no dispute with Peter, as the Jews had with John's disciples about purifying, but hold their *peace*, knowing that *God purifies the heart by* FAITH! In conclusion, we would say that the Jews addressed by Peter on the day of pentecost, either *did*, or did *not* believe in Christ *before baptism.* This will not be denied. If they did not believe, then their baptism so far from pleasing God was a sinful act; for "Without faith it is impossible to please God." "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin," (in all those cases where faith is required.) If on the other hand

they did believe before *baptism, then, were* THEY *justified before baptism;* for "all that *believe are* justified." "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ *is* born of God." I am aware that Campbellites object to this; and tell us that believers are not justified until *they* can get *their hands* upon them and *baptize* them; and that "*baptism* alone is that *act* of *turning* to God." But though they denounce all as heretics who will not come to them,—go down into the water, and let them plunge them under the water; I unhesitatingly confess "that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets." Acts xxiv. 14.

Though all should be declared heretics who believe that a man may receive pardon of sins without water, and without *their* aid, I freely acknowledge that I believe with Paul that "it is God that justifieth."—Rom. viii. 33. And as it regards the means of justification, or the principle on which we receive pardon, that it is faith without works; for "to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly his *faith* is counted to him *for* righteousness."—Rom. iv. 5. I believe also that God does not justify (in the sense of pardon) on *any other* principle; for Paul says, "Seeing it is one God that shall justify the circumcision *by faith*, and the circumcision *through faith*." "Without *faith* it

is impossible to please God." And now let me ask if it would not be far easier to prove that people were destroyed by immersion, than that they went to *heaven* by that means? If immersion *alone* is the act of turning to God, how many turned to God when he brought in the flood upon the world of the ungodly? How many turned to God when the Egyptian host were overwhelmed in the waters of the Red Sea? And what a *turning* there must have been, when the legion of devils entered into the herd of swine and urged them with all possible speed into the water? How many sins must have been forgiven in the cases above alluded to, if Campbellism be true, which says, "It is not our faith in God's promise of remission, but our going down into the water that obtains the remission of sins." We have now examined the case of the conversion of the Jews on the day of Pentecost; and find that it not only does *not* favor the system of our opponents, but is entirely opposed to it. And so forcibly does the truth of this appear, that A. C. is constrained to confess it. Christianity Restored, p. 218. "God by a stupendous display of Spiritual gifts, called *the baptism of the Holy Spirit*, had welcomed the first fruits of the Jews into his kingdom, before any one of the Jews had been immersed into the Lord Jesus. And as Peter explains this matter in Cornelius' case, it appears that God deter-

mined to make no difference between the Jews and Gentiles in receiving them into his kingdom." Well done Alexander! You have now "witnessed a good confession before many witnesses," in saying that God received both Jews and Gentiles into his kingdom before they had been immersed. On the 245 page you tell us, "God has *one* way of bestowing every thing." What a pity you should so soon contradict yourself, and the truth of God, by saying that baptism was the only door of entrance into the kingdom of God.

SAUL'S BAPTISM.

We now proceed to enquire the meaning of Acts xxii. 16.

"Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."

Here it is supposed there is proof of baptism for remission of sins, or in other words, that baptism was the means of pardon. We have before us a compound sentence, composed of three simple sentences. The first thing to be attended to, was to "arise;" the second, to "be baptized;" the third, "wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." By taking this view of the subject it will be seen by every intelligent person that the *act* of *baptism* had no more to do with *washing away sin*, than the act of *arising*; they *both* belong to another member of the sentence. It will be seen at once, that the *act* of *arising*, was not the *act* of *baptism;* neither was the act of *baptism*, the act of *washing away sin.*— They are separated by the copulative conjunction *and;* the office of which is to conjoin sentences, though each of these simple sentences conveys its own meaning, and points out its own requirement! If the expression, "wash away thy sins" means the

remission, or *forgiveness of sin*, still it would not follow that baptism was the *act* of turning, or the *means* of securing pardon. The *manner* of washing away sins or the *means* by which it is done is not baptism, but calling upon the name of the Lord. The active participle clearly points out the manner of obeying the injunction given; thus, "wash away thy sins, *calling* upon the name of the Lord." Here it will be seen that he was not left to judge of the means or manner of washing away sin, but the manner of doing, as well as the thing to be done, was specifically enjoined. But why thus particular in saying wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord? Because, "Whosoever shall *call* upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." "There is no other name given under heaven among men whereby we must be saved but the name of Jesus." "The Lord is nigh to all them that *call* upon him, to call them that *call upon him in* TRUTH.

How absurd the notion that baptism washes away sin, or that any operation of man by the application of matter upon our physical system, could cleanse us from moral pollution? Paul says, "In whom we have redemption through his (Christ's) blood, even the forgiveness of sins."—Col. i. 14. Now had Ananias said, Arise, and *wash away thy sins* BAPTIZING them away, I should think it likely that he believed in baptismal regeneration; but as he said,

"wash away thy sins *calling* on the *name* of the *Lord*," I consider him quite orthodox in his views upon that subject. But our opponents tell us that the *washing* and *baptism* are one and the same thing. Why then did he not say *wash away* thy sins *washing* them, or *baptize* away thy sins *baptizing* them? If we were told to destroy a house, *burning* it; would the requirement be fulfilled by destroying it in any other way? Certainly not! If we were required to cleanse a house, *sweeping* it, to cleanse a garment *washing* it, to cleanse one *shaking* it, to cleanse one *boiling* it, to cleanse one *brushing* it; the active participle, precisely points out the manner of cleansing, and there would be an impossibility of fulfilling the requirement in any other way, because the command embraces the *manner* of *doing*, as well as the *thing* to be *done*. Whoever, then, attempts to wash away sin by *baptism*, or by *baptizing* them away, attempts to do it in a manner unauthorized by the word of God, for the requirement was to wash them away by *calling on the name of the Lord*. Thus it is clearly shown, that baptism, belonging to another member of the sentence, was not intended to wash away sin! But we ask if the washing away of sin, is synonymous with forgiveness of sin? Is it certain that Saul was not pardoned before this requirement was made? This is a matter that requires serious attention. After sins have been forgiven is there no need

of having them washed away, or of being cleansed from unrighteousness? In I John i. 9. we read, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." Here the Apostle makes a clear distinction between the pardon, or *forgiveness* of sin, and the *cleansing*, or *washing away* of sin. If, then, after sins are forgiven, there is need of having them washed away or being cleansed from unrighteousness, Annanias might have had reference not to forgiveness of sin or removal of guilt, but a cleansing operation which may take place after justification. This is clearly expressed by Paul in 2 Cor. vii. 1. "Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." Certainly, Paul did not mean, let us BAPTIZE ourselves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit.

The language of Annanias to Saul gives evidence of Saul's conversion before baptism. See the good old man approaching this young penitent, and putting his hands upon him, and at the same time hear him say, "Brother Saul, the Lord even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost." Acts ix. 17. Now if Annanias had believed that no man could be a child of God, until he was baptized, Why call

him brother? Could he call him brother, (using the term in a religious sense,) unless they both belonged to the same family? How clear it is, that Saul was a converted man, that he was a believer in Jesus, or that Annanias was unconverted, and a child of the devil. It will hardly be necessary to inform the reader that when the term was not used in a religious and spiritual sense that it is made known by some circumstance or qualifying expression, as in Rom. ix. 3, "my *brethren*, my *kinsmen according to the flesh*." Annanias not only acknowledges Saul a brother in Christ, but tells him that Jesus had sent him that saul might receive his sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost. It will be seen that the receiving of his sight, and being filled with the Holy Ghost were placed next each other without a command to be baptized coming between them. So that he was not to be *baptized* and receive the Holy Ghost; but to receive his *sight* and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And as the Holy Ghost was given by the laying on of the Apostle's hands, so no doubt the Holy Ghost was given when Annanias laid his hands upon Saul and called him brother: but this was before baptism, therefore Saul was a converted man, a christian brother, a child of God before baptism. We would remark in conclusion, that the same principle will apply in this case, as in the case refered to, on the day of pentecost, if Saul was not a

believer in Christ before his baptism; his baptism itself was a sinful act, for "whatsoever is not of faith is sin!" If he was a believer before baptism, then was he justified before baptism, for "to him that *worketh not;* but *believeth* on him that justifieth the ungodly his *faith* is counted *for* righteousness."—Rom. iv. 5. Paul certainly understood the history of his own conversion, and the means by, or through which he was justified, as well as Alexander Campbell, or any other man; and he says *being justified by* FAITH WE *we have peace with* GOD. Rom. v. 1. Here he acknowledges that *he* as well as others, *was justified by faith;* and consequently, those who believe that baptism was administered for the purpose of washing away sins; and that the washing away of sins means justification, or pardon, have entirely misapprehended the meaning of that scripture.

Titus iii. 5, is sometimes adduced as favoring water regeneration. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior." This, our opponents would fain make us believe, teaches salvation by water baptism. But they will have some difficulty in ascertaining which of the terms in the sentence means baptism. The Apostle says, "by the washing of regeneration," now if the *washing*

is baptism, then it would read the *baptism* of regeneration; so that the noun, "*regeneration*" must be *baptized.* If the *regeneration*, is baptism, then it should read, the washing of *baptism;* then the *baptism* must be *washed.* If they *both* mean baptism; then it should read the *baptism* of *baptism;* in that case the *baptism* must be *baptized.* The Campbellite then to sustain himself upon this point must, if he understands this passage literally; either *baptize* the *regeneration*, *wash* the *baptism*, or *baptize* the *baptism.* But again if baptism is meant and we are saved by *baptism*, then Paul must have meant we are not saved by works of righteousness, but by *baptism.* What would this be, but saying baptism is not a work of righteousness? If Paul should tell us that baptism was not a righteous work; surely the Campbellite would pronounce him a heretic; yet he must *mean* this, to sustain their view that we are saved by *baptism*, and not by *works* of *righteousness* which we have done. Again if baptism is that by which he saved us, then immersion is overthrown, for we are saved by that which he *shed on us;* and not by that into which we were *immersed.* No doubt our opponents will say, (and what will they not say, rather than confess the truth,) that the relative *which*, refers to the latter member of the sentence only. Why then does not Paul say that we were plunged into one, and the other was poured on us?

Answer. Because there was no plunging in the case, but on the contrary they were saved by that which was *poured*, or *shed* on them. If, then, *water baptism* be meant, then *that baptism* is by *pouring;* if the baptism of the *Spirit* be meant, then the advocates of water regeneration are utterly defeated, and *they* clearly convicted of *heresy*. Which horn of the dilemma they will *choose*, I know not!!

We would now call the attention of the reader to another passage of Scripture by which the advocates of water regeneration would endeavor to sustain their sentiment. It is found in 1 Pet. iii. 21. "The like figure whereunto *even* baptism doth also now save us." &c.

Mr. Campbell in reference to this text, says, in "Christianity Restored," page 221. "Thus immersion, says Peter, saves us, not by cleansing the body from its filth, but the conscience from its guilt; yes immersion saves us by burying us with Christ, raising us with him, and so our consciences are purified from dead works to serve the living God. On the 243 page he says, Peter taught all the saints in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bythynia, that the water of Baptism saved them, as the water of the deluge saved Noah in the ark; and that in immersion a person was purged from all his former sins. On the 272d page, he has the following language; "No one, acquainted with Peter's style, will think it

strange that Paul represents persons as saved, cleansed, or sanctified by water; seeing Peter unequivocally asserts that *we are saved* through water, or through baptism as was Noah and his family through water and faith in God's promise. 'The Antitype immersion, does also now save us." '—*New translation.*

Mr. C. here testifies that Peter says immersion saves us. Now Peter says no such thing. And had he said it, he would have said what was not true, and would have stood convicted of the heresy of Campbellism; especially if by salvation he meant the remission of sins. But Peter never said it, therefore Mr. C. is guilty of a violation of the law which says, "Though shalt not bear false witness." Peter says, "few that is eight souls were saved by water." Now if immersion was that which saved them, then not a few, but multitudes were saved by water, for multitudes were immersed!! What a sorry figure Mr. C. cuts with Peter's figure of the Christian baptism.—"The like figure (says Peter) whereunto *even* baptism doth also now save us." How manifestly ignorant, or wicked, must that man be, who will declare that Peter taught "that *in immersion* a person was *purged* from all his *former sins.*" Peter does not teach that any of those that were immersed were purged from their sins. Nor does he teach that *Noah* and his *family* were purged at that time from

their sins. In Gen. vii. 1, we read, "And the Lord said unto Noah, come thou and all thy house into the ark; for thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation." Peter says in his second epistle, ii chap. and 5 verse that God "spared not the old world, but saved Noah the eighth *person*, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly." Here we learn that he was not only a righteous man, but a preacher of righteousness before he entered the ark. How then could he be purged from his sins by water? But Mr. C. concludes that it need not be thought strange that Paul should represent persons as saved, cleansed, or sanctified by water, seeing Peter unequivocally asserts that we are saved through water as was Noah, &c. For my own part I do not think it strange that Paul taught that we are saved, and sanctified by water, for he never taught that doctrine nor any other Campbellite heresy; but he taught contrary to Campbellism, that these blessings were obtained by *faith.* I however do think it strange that any man pretending to common sense, and common honesty, should bear false witness, against not only Peter and Paul, but every one of the inspired writers, and endeavor to overthrow all the fundamental principles of the christian religion.

Mr. Campbell tells us *we must be saved* by *water* as *Noah was*, and therefore we must be immersed

for the purpose of obtaining pardon of sin. How superlatively ridiculous must this appear to those who are acquainted with the Scriptures, and know that Noah was not saved (in the sense of pardon) by water; and that he was not *saved in any* sense of the word by *putting him into the water*, but by *keeping him out.* The figure of baptism then, was not immersion, but by the descent of the water upon the ark. The ark was not immersed, but on the contrary it was borne upon the surface of the water; and all that were saved, were saved not *by immersion*, but *from it.* Let Mr. C. then, or any other man, teach that immersion saves us by burying us with Christ, and raising us with him, that by this means our consciences are purged from dead works to serve the living God; I shall agree with Paul (even though I should with him be charged with heresy) that all this is effected by the blood of Christ. "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God."—Heb. ix. 14. We have now seen, 1st. That Noah was not saved *by immersion*, but *from it.*—2d. That the salvation of which Peter speaks was not justification, or pardon, for he was justified long before the ark was built. 3. That so far from sustaining Mr. C's. favorite theory, this text is fatal to the doctrine of justification by water; and clearly

and fully establishes the contrary principle. 4. That as we are to be saved on the same principle, as that on which Noah was saved, we must be saved by being kept *out of the water*; and not by being *put in*; Campbellism to the contrary notwithstanding.

We will now present to the reader Mr. C's. method of reconciling Paul in Phillipi, and Peter in Jerusalem. Christianity Restored, page 256. "Thousands ask Peter *what shall* I do? The jailor asks Paul, *What shall I do?* TO BE SAVED, if the reader pleases. Peter says, reform and be baptized, every one of you, &c. Paul answers, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved with thy family." How is this, Paul and Peter? Why do you not preach the same gospel, and answer the same question in the same or similar terms? Paul, do you preach another gospel to the gentiles, than that Peter preached to the Jews? What sayest thou Paul? Paul replies, "Strike, but hear me. Had I been in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, I would have spoken as Peter did. Peter spoke to penitent and believing Jews; I spake to an ignorant Roman jailor. I arrested his attention after the earthquake, by simply announcing that there was salvation to him and his family, through belief in Jesus." "But why did you not mention repentance, baptism, the Holy Spirit?" "Who told you I did not?" "Luke says nothing about it, and I concluded you said noth-

ing about them. Luke was a faithful historian was he not?" "Yes, very faithful; and why do you not faithfully hearken to his account? Does he not immediately subjoin, that as soon as I got the jailor's ear, I *spoke* the word of the Lord to him, and to all them that were in his house?" "Why, you reason like a paido-baptist. You think do you, that the jailor's children were saved by his faith?" "I spoke the whole gospel, or the word of the Lord, to the jailor and *to his family.* In speaking *the word of the Lord*, I mentioned repentance, baptism, remission, the Holy Spirit, the resurrection, Judgment, and eternal life: else why should I have baptized him and all his house; and why should he have rejoiced afterwards with all his family!!" "Paul, I beg your pardon. I will not now interrogate Peter, for I know how he will answer me:—he would say, —"Had I been in Philippi, I would have spoken to an ignorant pagan as Paul did, to show that salvation flowed through faith in Jesus; and when he believed this and repented, I would *then* have said, Be baptized for the remission of your sins." This is Mr. C's. method of reconciling Peter and Paul, not with one another, but with his views of justification by water; for instead of having Peter agree with Paul that without the shedding of blood there is no remission; he would constrain them to agree with him, that without a pond of water there is no

remission. Truly, this is reconciling the *Apostles* with a *vengeance!* For instead of making them agree with each other, he makes them *contradict* the word of God to agree with *him*. He tells us Paul preached the whole gospel to them; and yet it is certain he did not preach one half of the night.—Query. Did he preach more than the whole gospel, when on another occasion he preached during the whole night? Or did he talk faster on one occasion than on the other? But he thinks that he preached *baptism* in his sermon; and he certainly would, had he been a *Campbellite*. But I do not believe he would in that case have delayed baptism, until his stripes were washed! What a cruel man he must have been to neglect baptizing the jailor and family, until he had provided for his own comfort; especially as his salvation did not at all depend upon having his stripes washed; whereas if Campbellism be true the jailor was an unpardoned sinner, and had the wrath of God abiding upon him, while he was performing that act of kindness toward the Apostles, notwithstanding his repentance and faith, for says Mr. C. *immersion alone* is the act of turning to God. I should really think that Paul would have turned him to God by baptism (if that was the means of remission,) before he had him perform the laborious task of washing and dressing the wounds made by the stripes that had been inflicted upon Silas, and

himself. It is not likely that his life was ensured, and if not, he might have died before baptism, and consequently if Campbellism be true he would have died an unpardoned sinner, notwithstanding all his repentance and faith! But it is thought by some that he was not pardoned until after *baptism*, because there is no mention of his rejoicing until after baptism. But does this prove that *baptism* and not *faith* was the condition of salvation? As well might you prove that *repentance*, and *faith*, and *baptism*, were not *any* or *all* of them the condition of salvation; but the *setting of meat* before the Apostles, for there is not a word said about rejoicing until meat was set before them.

But we would remark, that Luke, so far from agreeing with Mr. C. that baptism is the means of enjoyment, does not say, that he rejoiced being *baptized* and all his house; but "he rejoiced *believing in God* with all his house." Luke then agrees with Paul that *faith*, and not *baptism* is the source of the *christians joy*. "We have access by FAITH into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." Rom. v. 2. "rejoiced, *believing* in God with all his house." Acts xvi. 34. Peter says that God *by faith purified* the hearts of the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius, and of the Jews at Jerusalem. Acts xv. ix. Of these four witnesses then, which we have just examined, we have found them

all orthodox except *Alexander Campbell.* And having ascertained that the Jews were purified by *faith*, that God hath opened the door of *faith* to the *Gentiles;* that *all* that *believed are justified;* and that to him that *worketh not*, but *believeth* on him that justifieth the ungodly his *faith* is counted *for righteousness;* we may venture to say, to every penitent trembling mourner, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." If Paul meant *baptism*, when he said *faith*, so do we. If Paul was in an error upon this point so are we.

If Mr. C. is right we are wrong, and Peter, and Paul, and all the inspired writers are in the same condemnation, for "to him give all the prophets witness that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Acts x. 43.

On the 222d page of "Christianity Restored," Mr. C. says: "But as it is not our object to quote, and expatiate upon all the sacred testimonies, direct and allusive to immersion for the remission of sins, we shall close the proof and illustration of this proposition with an incidental allusion to the cleansing efficacy of this institution, found in the 2d Epistle of Peter i. 9. After enumerating the additions to faith necessary to secure our calling and election, of which courage is the first, and charity, or universal love, the last; the Apostle says, that "he who has not these

things is blind, shutting his eyes, and forgetting that he was *purified from his old* sins." I need not here say, that this is, perhaps, (and certainly as far as I know) universally understood to refer to christian immersion. The '*old sins*,' or '*former sins*,' can we presume, mean no other sins than those washed away in immersion. No person has yet attempted to show that these words can import any thing else. It is one of the most unequivocal, and, because incidental, one of the most decisive proofs, that, in Peter's judgment, all former sins were remitted in immersion. With Peter we began our proof of this position, and with Peter we shall end our proof of it. He first proclaimed reformation for the remission of sins; and in his last, and farewell letter to the christian communities, he reminds them of that purification from sin, received in, and through immersion; and in the strongest terms cautions them against forgetting that they were so purified." Is it not passing strange, that any man should *even pretend* to *think;* much less to make *others think*, that Peter in this place had an allusion to *baptism for remission of sins?* The attempt is ridiculous in the *extreme!* But what else could he do? If he is determined to prove a doctrine which is not sustained by any text when rightly understood, what better can he do than to misrepresent the sacred oracles, and pretend to find proof where there is

not the least shadow of it? He says, "The old sins, or former sins, can we *presume*, mean no other sins than those washed away in immersion."—His *proof*, then, amounts to mere PRESUMPTION. This, he tells us, is one of the most unequivocal, and one of the most decisive proofs; so that his best proof is: *we* PRESUME! What a *presumptious* man he must be, to *presume* to establish an important point in theology upon mere *presumption*. But he is not content with being in error himself, he would involve Peter in the same difficulty and absurdity, for he considers this as proof that in *Peter's judgment*, all former sins were remitted in immersion. And as Peter felt an anxiety lest they should forget that they had been purged from their former sins, (that is, according to Campbellism, that they had been immersed) what a pity it is, that he did not think to publish their *immersion* in something like Mr. C's. *Millennial Harbinger*, to keep them in remembrance of the time of their *immersion!* And if there was danger of their forgetting that their sins were remitted in immersion, he could frequently republish the account of their turning to God in the water; and inform them that "*immersion* ALONE was that act of turning to God!" And perhaps this might have been of some advantage to *Paul*, as he seemed to forget the number he baptized, (or, according to Mr. C. *regenerated*,) at Co-

ninth, had it been published in Peter's Millennial Harbinger he could have referred to it, and ascertained the exact *number*. And perhaps it might have been an advantage to Paul in other respects to have had a Millennial Harbinger like that published by Mr. Campbell; for it is certain that had he read and believed all that Mr. C. has published; he would never have been guilty of saying that we are "justified by *faith*," without informing us that he meant an act resulting from faith; namely, immersion. And instead of saying "*all* that *believe* ARE *justified*," he would have been taught to say, "It is not our faith in God's promise of remission, but our going down into the water that obtains the remission of sins." "Without *water* it is impossible to please God. But having no such advantages, he embraced the contrary sentiment, that, "without FAITH it is impossible to please him."—Heb. xi. 6.

THE EMPHATIC QUESTION.

On the 217–18 pages of "Christianity Restored," Mr. Campbell asks what he calls the emphatic question. This he puts in capitals and no doubt intends it for a choker! Hear him: "*Whether do they think, believe, teach, and practise more wisely and more safely; who think, believe, and teach, that grace, faith, the blood of Jesus, the name of the Lord, and immersion, are all essential to immediate pardon and acceptance; or they who say that faith only, grace only, the blood of Christ only, the name of the Lord only—and immersion not at all?*" Here Mr. C. has concentrated all his force, and brought all his ingenuity to bear upon this point. And as he knew it to be easier to ask, than to answer questions, especially unfair ones, he submits this question. he tells us, to all men, women, and children, of common sense. As all the force of the argument which he would derive from this question may be overthrown by means of another question, and as no one has a better right to ask a question than a yankee; I shall take the liberty to ask him an emphatic question.—*Whether do they think, believe, teach, and practice more wisely and more safely; who think, believe, and teach, with Christ, that "he that be-*

lieveth on the Son hath everlasting life," (John iii. 36,) with Paul, that "*all that believe are justified*," with John, "*Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God*," and with Peter, "*Whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins;*" or they who teach, *contrary* to *Scripture*, and *according* to *Campbell*, "*that it is not faith, but an act resulting from faith, which changes our state*," "*It is not our faith in God's promise of remission but our going down into the water that obtains the remission of sins.*" "*Immersion alone is that act of turning to God.*" This question is submitted not only to Mr. C. but to our readers also." But must we be understood as excluding the blood of Christ, the grace of God, and the name of the Lord Jesus; because we say with Paul that we are justified by faith? surely the *grace* of God is not excluded, for Luke tells us, the disciples "believed through *grace*." Acts xviii. 27. Paul says, Eph. ii. 8, "by *grace* are ye saved through faith." "It is of faith, that it might be by *grace;*" Rom. iv. 16. Salvation by faith does not exclude the blood of Christ; for "we have redemption through his *blood*, even the forgiveness of sins." Col. i. 14. "God hath set forth (Jesus Christ) to be a propitiation through faith in his *blood*." Rom. iii. 25, "without shedding of *blood* there is no *remission*." Heb. ix. 22. It does not exclude the *name* of *Christ*, "for there is none

other *name* under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts iv. 12. "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his *name* whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." I am aware that A. Campbell would fain have it believed that salvation by faith would exclude the grace of God and the blood of Christ, but we regard not his teachings, so long as Luke tells us that we *believe* through grace, and Paul that it is of *faith* that it might be by *grace;* and that he is a propitiation through *faith* in his *blood.*—(We are aware also that he lays much stress upon the expression *through his name*, to make us believe that HIS NAME means *baptism.* Nothing however is more absurd; for we are required to *believe on his name*, yet it will not be thought I presume, that we are required to believe on his *baptism.*

Mr. C. charges us with excluding *all* but faith from the system of salvation, but let it be recollected, that although it might be correct, if we were contending for justification by a mere belief of facts, or the faith of Devils, yet the charge is now false, inasmuch as we contend for a faith which implies confidence in the promises of God, engages our affections, takes hold of the boon of heaven; and is the medium through which God communicates his saving grace to the soul; it is indeed that which unites to Christ, as the branch to the vine, and with-

out which no man can please the Lord. Christ is the vine we are the branches, not, however, natural branches, but must be grafted in. This is clearly set forth under the figure of the olive tree, in the 11th chap. of Rom. Paul declares, some branches were broken off, others grafted in. The principle of union was faith, (and not water) for "because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith." That it was faith by which they were united or grafted, as well as that by which they stood, is evident, because it was for the want of faith that they were broken off; and he tells us that "if they abide not still in unbelief they shall be graffed in: for God is able to graff them in again." Here then we learn that it is faith and unbelief, which are represented as the two opposing principles which cause the union or disunion. And as in a case of grafting the branch must first be cut off, so repentance must precede that faith which unites us to Christ, grafts us, or in other words baptizes us into Christ; Paul says, "For as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." That this baptizing into Christ is by *faith* and not by *water* is clearly declared in the preceding verse, "for ye are all the children of God by *faith* in Christ Jesus." Now it is certain that the cutting off, of a branch, is not the grafting, neither is the grafting, the bearing of fruit. Nor yet does the branch unite with the tree and live,

because it bears fruit; but on the other hand it bears fruit because it has life, it has life because of the union existing between that and the vine. Thus the Apostle Paul says, "the life I now live, I live by the faith of the Son of God." Notwithstanding all this, Mr. C. says, "that it is not faith but an *act* resulting from faith, which changes our state." C. R. page 198. This *act* he elsewhere tell us is "*immersion alone!*" It seems that Paul and Campbell are continually at variance; for while one says that it is not faith by which our state is changed; the other spent almost his whole life in endeavoring to establish the doctrine of justification by faith. One says it is by an *act*; by *immersion alone;* the other says, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done,"—"Not of works lest any man should boast." Paul also says, "It is God that Justifieth." "If they abide not in unbelief, they shall be grafted in; for God is able to graff them in again." Here Paul teaches that God is able to accomplish the work of grafting. Mr. Campbell teaches that God is not able, without the help of some one to *immerse* the individual that is to become a child of God. And the only legitimate conclusion drawn from his premises is, that all the powers of heaven and earth combined, cannot save one soul without water. Shall we then believe with Mr. C. that we are translated either by himself, or some of his party into another state or kingdom;

or with Paul, that it is "God that hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son:—In whom we have redemption through his blood, *even* the forgiveness of sins?" Collossians i. 13, 14. Let the reader reflect upon this subject, and may the Spirit of God lead, and guide us into all truth; that the truth may make *us* free.

We have now passed through an examination of those Scriptures mostly relied upon to sustain the view that Mr. Campbell has taken of the efficacy of water baptism, and have found that any, or all of them taken together, so far from sustaining his views upon that point will, when closely, and carefully investigated, and properly explained, overthrow, and utterly demolish his whole system. The word of God, is not inconsistent with itself, for being dictated by the same Spirit, it harmonizes in all its parts; and presents the same leading doctrine of justification by faith. The Scriptures bear testimony to the excellency of the faith of Abel and of Enoch; by the which one offered an acceptable sacrifice, and the other was translated; (I suppose that even Mr. C. will hardly say he was translated by water,) and so of all the ancient worthies, it cannot be proved that any one of them was justified (in the sense of pardon) by works; it is never said that one of their *works* was counted to them for righteousness, but on

the contrary that *faith* was counted *for righteousness.* Now if the Scripture had said that Abraham was *immersed*, and *it* was counted to him *for righteousness;* this one passage, would have done more; *infinitely more*, to sustain Campbellism, than all that can be done by Alex. Campbell and his satellites in misconstructing, misrepresenting, and mistranslating the word of God. This, so far from being the case, is directly opposed by all the Apostles and prophets when speaking as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Our Savior himself says, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that *whosoever* BELIEVETH in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John iii. 16. And Peter says, (and I have no right to contradict him,) "To him give GIVE ALL THE PROPHETS WITNESS that *through his name whosoever believeth* in him shall receive *remission of sins.*" But those who oppose Peter's views upon this point, will say that *his name* implies water baptism. But we ask by what authority they convert the name of Jesus into baptism? The same no doubt by which they convert baptism into immersion. Neither of them however, is authorized by the word of God. If the name of Christ means *baptism*, and baptism means *immersion*, then when the Apostles raised the dead in the name of Christ, they raised them through immersion; and when Peter said to the lame man, "In the *name* of *Jesus*

Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk," he must have meant that in *immersion* he should rise up and walk. We wish it distinctly understood that when Peter speaks of remission of sins in the *name* of *Christ*, he tells us that *all* the *Prophets* have borne testimony to the same effect! Now if the interpretation given by Mr. C. be correct that remission through the *name of Christ* means *water baptism*, then *all* the *Prophets* have given their testimony concerning *Christian baptism*; and as they never used terms in reference to the use of water, which do not signify sprinkling and pouring, and as we agree that the Scriptures recognize but one mode; then immersion is overthrown, and they are left unbaptized! By their own creed then, they must be excluded from the kingdom of God!!!

Certainly those who can find evidence of water regeneration in this text merely because the name of Christ is mentioned, will never be convinced of their error by sober reasoning, and plain argument from the word of God! How beautifully is the condition of the individual described by the Apostle in his statement concerning the olive tree. How clearly does he thereby unfold the mysteries of the gospel of the Son of God; teaching us that *faith unites to Christ*, and that *unbelief destroys that union.* And yet, he tells us there is something in this contrary to nature; "wert graffed *contrary* to *nature*

into a good olive tree." If we understand what is according to nature, we can easily tell what the Apostle means when he says contrary to nature.—The Common practice in grafting is, to select a branch from a tree which bears good fruit, and why? because it is natural for the branch to continue to bear the same kind of fruit that it did while on the tree on which it first grew. Take a branch from a tree bearing good fruit, and ingraft into a crabapple tree, it will produce good fruit, take a branch from a crabapple, ingraft it into another, if it unites and bears fruit, it will produce crabapples still! But our ungrafting into Christ is contrary to nature; though taken from the wild olive tree our nature is so changed by our union to Christ, that we have now our "fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life."

We have already shown that the Scriptural account of the conversion of the first Gentile converts at the house of Cornelius, stands directly opposed to Mr. C's views of remission by baptism; yet perhaps it will not be amiss to consider the subject a little further. The first thing mentioned in relation to his case is, that he was a *devout* man, that he was a *praying* man, one that feared God, and gave much alms to the people.—Acts x. 2. We learn further that his prayers, and alms came up for a memorial before God.—Verse 4. He had not as

yet, however, been thoroughly instructed in reference to the principles, and privileges of the gospel. He was therefore required to send for Peter to tell him what he ought to do.—Verse 6. "Who shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house, shall be saved."—Chap. xi. 14. When Peter arrived he made enquiry in relation to the intention of Cornelius in sending for him. Cornelius in few words tells him his experience; with which Peter is fully satisfied, as far as it related to his acceptance with God. Yet Peter did not believe that what he had experienced was all that God would do for him, he believed that an increase of faith, and a growth in grace was necessary to the enjoyment of a greater salvation. He commences his sermon by saying that God had sent Jesus Christ (who is Lord of all) to preach peace to the children of Israel, he says that Cornelius already knew the word that was published throughout all Judea, which began from Gallilee after the baptism which John preached. He then gives a short history of Christ, his life, his death upon the cross, his resurrection, the witnesses who were permitted to eat and drink with him subsequent to his resurrection; that they were commanded to preach to the people, and to testify that Jesus Christ was ordained of God to be the Judge of the living and the dead. And having established and confirmed them in these fundamental

principles of the christian religion; he proceeded to point out more definitely, the condition of pardon or remission of sin through the name of Christ! This was a proper course, for certainly it will not be contended that all the kinsmen, and near friends of Cornelius whom he had called together, had, with him found acceptance with God. At all events Peter proclaims salvation in the name of Jesus, and specifically points out the condition upon which all mankind might be accepted of God. "*To him give* ALL THE PROPHETS witness *that through his name* WHOSOEVER BELIEVETH *in him shall receive* REMISSION OF SINS." Whoever then denies this fact; that the *believer* in Christ obtains "*remission of sins*," and that "*all that believe are justified*," denies the truth of God; and arrays himself against the testimony of "ALL THE PROPHETS." Let God be true, though it should prove every man a liar; and it certainly will every man who denies this sacred, and soul cheering truth!—The sermon Peter preached, proved effectual; the gospel he proclaimed, proved the power of God unto salvation to all that heard the word; "God which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, (says Peter) even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us and them *purifying* their *hearts by faith*." Acts xv. 8, 9. Just at the very moment Peter proclaimed salvation in the name, or through the name of Christ, telling them

that *whosoever believed* in him should receive remission of sins; God poured his Spirit upon them, they shouted the praise of God, or in the language of Luke, spake with tongues, and magnified (praised) (extoled) God. All this took place before Peter said one word about their being baptized. And when he did speak of having them baptized it was not that they might obtain forgiveness and receive the Holy Ghost, but because they *had* received the Holy Ghost, and because, (as he afterwards tells us) their hearts were purified by faith. If faith was not the condition upon which they were pardoned and accepted of God; if they were not admitted into the kingdom of God before baptism; Peter was the most consummate deceiver that ever lived, (perhaps Paul should be excepted) for he says not one word about salvation by water. And so far from sustaining Mr. Campbell's view that he was to perform an ordinance whereby they were to be saved; it is expressly said Acts xi. 14, that he was to *tell them* WORDS *whereby they were to be saved.* These WORDS he *did tell them* and in doing so, he agreed with Christ, and all the prophets; that WHOSOEVER BELIEVETH in Jesus shall receive the remission of sins. "Whosoever," that is *any one;* any individual, wherever he may be; however far from the water; whatever may be his circumstances, rich or poor; whoever he may be, king or beggar, bond or free,

white or black, "All that *believe are justified.*"—"This is the *victory even* our *faith.* But Mr. C. will not consent to this. He tells us that Luke, in recording the commission given by the Savior, "neither mentions faith nor immersion," but that he "metonymically places repentance, or rather reformation, for faith; and *remission of sins*, for immersion." "In Luke's acceptation and time forgiveness of sins stood for immersion, and reformation for faith—the effect for the means or cause." C. R. page 241. What an easy matter it is for Mr. Campbell to find immersion. When Paul says, "baptized into Jesus Christ" according to his views he means immersion. When he says, "buried with him by baptism into DEATH, it means *immersion* in WATER. When he says, "By one SPIRIT are we all baptized into *one body* whether Jews or Gentiles; it means *immersion* not by one Spirit but by many men!—When the Saviour commissioned Paul to *turn* the people to God, he meant *immerse* them. Where the expressions *born* of *water* and *regeneration* occur; they mean *immersion.* Where the *name* of Christ is used, it means *immersion.* When Peter says repent, and be *converted;* it means *immersion.* When the children of Israel were baptized, though they stood on dry ground, and he thinks that there was not a drop of water fell on them, yet in his view it was immersion. When Nebuchadnezzar was

baptized by the *descent* of *the dew* upon his body it means *immersion.* When the spirit was *poured* upon the people on the day of Pentecost it means *immersion.* The *baptism of fire* means *immersion* in *hell fire.* When Luke records the commission of the Savior, and says that "*repentance* and *remission* of sins should be preached among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem," Mr. C. says, he places *remission of sins* for immersion; and that in his acceptation *forgiveness of sins* stood *for immersion.* Here is the climax of folly! FORGIVENESS OF SINS STANDS FOR IMMERSION! In Luke's *acceptation* and TIME, he tells us, forgiveness *stood for* immersion. If so, when the Savior says, "*forgive* and ye shall be *forgiven*," he meant immerse and ye shall be immersed. When Paul says, "if any have a quarrel against any, even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye," he meant as Christ immersed you, so also do ye. The Savior says "if thy brother trespass against thee rebuke him, and if he repent *forgive* him, that is, according to Mr. C's. dictionary *immerse* him. If we confess our sins he is faithful and just, to *forgive* us our sins; that is to *immerse* us. Is it any wonder that he should say, "*immersion* ALONE is that act of turning to God!" He must have a *new dictionary*, as well as a *new translation*, or he could not make every thing mean immersion: and immersion the *sine qua non* of the

Christian religion! If all the before mentioned things mean immersion, according to his lexicon, why should he not be consistent with himself, and agree that when we baptize by sprinkling or pouring it is also immersion? Or does he think it would require more water for us to baptize one person, than it did to baptize six hundred thousand of the Israelites! But error is never consistent with itself. He that asserts a falsehood, it is said will have to invent twenty more to maintain that one! And we fear that Mr. Campbell having erred in regard to the fundamental principles of the christian religion; will continue to "wax worse and worse; deceiving and being deceived." Mr. Campbell takes the ground in reference to the subject of remission; that baptism is for the remission of *past* sins! In the Christian Baptist, page 416, he says, "that *in*, and *by*, the *act of immersion*, so soon as our *bodies* are *put under water*, at that very *instant* our *former*, or '*old sins*' are all *washed away;* provided only, that we are *true believers*." Now that the sins of *true believers* are washed away, will not be denied by any orthodox christian! But it is denied, that the TRUE BELIEVER must wait till he is *put* UNDER WATER, for the pardon of his sins; and that he receives remission in the *very act;* and at *that very* INSTANT. We all agree, that when an adult is to be baptized, faith in Christ is required previou-

to the administration of the ordinance. The point at issue is; is that believer unpardoned until he is immersed? Mr. Campbell affirms, I deny! We must therefore appeal to the law, and the testimony. We would *fain hope* that the testimony now to be adduced will not be *rejected*. It is the *highest authority* to which we can *appeal*—the authority of Jesus Christ. We find it in John iii. 18, "he that *believeth* on him is not *condemned*." Look at the expression: "IS NOT CONDEMNED." Now if it can be shown that a person can be *unpardoned*, and at the *same time not condemned*; we yield the point at issue: but if this cannot *be;* then Campbellism is stabbed to the vitals with the sword of the Spirit; which is the word of God!!! It is also denied that the Scripture authorizes the expression "*put under water*," in reference to christian baptism! I would now ask, how Mr. Campbell knows that it was remission of *past* sins that Peter alluded to? I am sure he does not say so. Paul, however, tells us expressly what is for the remission of sins that are past! "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; Whom God hath set forth *to be* a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, *I say*, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him

that believeth in Jesus."—Rom. iii. 24, 25, 26.—Does this look like being "*put under water*" for the remission of *past* sins?

Again I ask, does the expression "be baptized *for* the remission of sins," (even if it were not connected with any of the christian graces;) prove that it was in that *act* we receive remission? Certainly not! From Math. xxvi. 28, we learn that the blood of Christ was shed *for* the remission of sins! Now I ask, can it be supposed that sins remitted through the blood of Christ, were remitted at the very time his blood was shed? Were there no sins remitted before his blood was shed? We might as well attempt to prove that no person was ever justified before the death and resurrection of Christ, because "he died for our sins," and was "raised again for our justification," as to attempt to prove that no person's sins were forgiven before baptism, because it is written "repent and be baptized for the remission of sins." The blood of Christ was shed "*for* the remission of sins." He "bare our sins in his own body on the tree"—He "died *for* our sins" and "was raised again *for* our justification," but it is denied that our actual sins are forgiven before we have faith in the atoning sacrifice! The difference between us is this; they contend that however *genuine* the *repentance*, however strong the *faith*, however ardent the *love*, we have to the Savior, we are unpardoned, and lost to all christian life and enjoyment until we

have been immersed; we contend, that faith and unbelief, are the two opposing principles! Mr. C. in Christianity Restored, page 199, represents "immersion, as that act by which our state is changed." Again, on the same page he tells us, it is that "by which ALONE they could be pardoned." We say, "We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings:—Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort."—Discipline, art. 9, page 12. Now the question *is*, who is right? Whose sentiment will be sustained by an appeal to the Scripture? Does the Scripture say, "immersion alone?" No! That word is not in the book of God!!! Does the Scripture say, "only believe?" Yes! In Mark v. 36, Jesus says, "Be not afraid, *only believe*."—Should it be said, this does not refer to his justification, I would ask, could he have been justified in disobedience to that requirement? All must answer; No! Again I ask, Do the Scriptures say that he that is *baptized* is *not condemned*; or that he that is *not baptized is condemned?* There is not such a word or such a sentiment in the word of God, though Mr. C's. theology abounds with it! Well: Does the Scripture teach, that, "He that believeth on the Son *hath* everlasting life?" Yes;

this is expressly declared, John iii. 36, and in John iii. 18 it is said, "He that *believeth on him* is *not condemned:* but he that believeth not is condemned," and lest it should be thought that he was condemned because he was not *baptized* in the name of Christ, it is expressly said, he is condemned "*because* he hath not BELIEVED *in the name* of the only begotten Son of God"!!! Let us again enquire. Does the Scripture say to him that *believeth not*, but is *baptized* his *baptism* is counted to him *for righteousness?* It says no such thing! What then does it say? It says, "To him that worketh not, *but believeth* on him that justifieth the ungodly, *his faith* is counted for righteousness."—Rom. iv. 5. We may, then, conclude with safety, and with certainty, that no true believer is for one moment in a state of condemnation; and that no unbeliever is justified! A justified unbeliever; or an unjustified believer, is not known in the theology of the Bible!!! Let Mr. C. then call his system of theology any thing but the gospel of Christ. Let him say, (as he does in his Christian Baptist, page 417,) "immersion is the gospel in water," but let him not profane the name of Christ by associating it with his system of salvation which is in all its *distinguishing characteristics* so *manifestly opposed* to that *gospel revealed* to us in the *sacred oracles!!!*

Notwithstanding Mr. C's. direct opposition to the

truth of God, he would fain make us believe that there is some agreement between the two systems. But how can he do this? Why, by telling us that seven things are spoken of in the Scriptures as the means of justification! C. R., page 254. The argument (if such it may be called) is this: "there are seven things by which we are said to be justified, but neither of these is baptism, therefore, we are justified by baptism." If this is *not* the argument, there is no argument to be drawn from it in favor of his system; if it *is* the argument, how logical!!—but he refers to those scriptures which speak of justification by works to prove that sins are remitted by works! But *he* knows, and every man of common sense, acquainted with the facts of the case knows, that James, (in speaking of the justification of Abraham, and Rahab the harlot by works,) did not use the term justification in the sense of pardon, as Paul does. What then, is his argument in this case?—Let us see! Abraham and Rahab, were justified by works, (*one* by offering Isaac upon the altar, the *other* by receiving the spies, and sending them out another way;) therefore our sins are remitted by baptism! If this will not *do*, try again, Abraham, and Rahab were justified by works, but not in the sense of pardon, therefore we are justified in the sense of pardon by baptism! That this justification spoken of by James, in the case of Rahab, does not

mean pardon, any person may see by consulting the 2d and 6th chapters of Joshua. If any one thinks that she was justified (in the sense of pardon) by asserting a falsehood, he is welcome to do so; sound reason, and Scriptural argument in his case, will avail nothing!

Logical reason and bible truth, will never avail in the case of those who suffer their opinion to contradict their faith! Mr. C's. faith is that sins are not remitted without an immersion; his opinion *is:* that sins may be remitted without it! Therefore his faith is, that his opinion is wrong; and his opinion is, that his faith is wrong! It is quite likely that in many cases they are *both* wrong!!!

The subject of the conversion of the Ethiopian Eunuch demands some attention. From the account given by Luke, we learn that he had been at Jerusalem to worship. That he had the Jewish Scriptures, and that he was engaged in reading them on his journey from the place of worship. He did not, however, fully understand them, and desired Philip to expound to him the prophecy of Isaiah concerning the Messiah which he had just read; for Luke tells us he "read Esaias (Isaiah) the prophet."—"Philip began at the same Scripture, (I suppose he *had no translation* of his *own,*) and preached unto him Jesus." And having been informed by Philip that Christ had commissioned his ministers to teach all

nations baptizing them; and as he had just read in that prophecy which he desired Philip to expound, that the nations were to be sprinkled; Isaiah lii. 15. he felt a willingness to become a disciple of Jesus, indeed he was now a firm believer in the Son of God.

As they went on their way, coming to a certain water; he says to Philip, "See *here is* water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?" Philip said "if thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest," he replied, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still, and they went down both (eis) into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch and he baptized him." The only matter with which we are at present concerned, is, to know when, and by what means he was pardoned, whether before, or at the time of his baptism. Campbellites tell us he could not be pardoned before, that immersion is inseparably connected with remission. "In immersion a person is purged." and that "Sins are washed away in immersion." Now I intend to prove that Campbellism is palpably absurd, and grossly heretical; or that the word of God is false. It will be borne in mind that Philip required faith, in order to baptism. We do not mean a bare assent to the truth, but that which affected the heart. "If thou believest with *all* thine heart," The Eunuch professed faith in the Son of God. And if he

had not the faith of the *heart*, he intended to deceive Philip, and was guilty of falsehood. *This* will not be contended for. It is then clear that the Eunuch was a true believer in Christ before he left the Chariot. He was therefore a child of God; justified, and in possession of everlasting life. The Savior says, "He that believeth on the Son *hath* everlasting life." Paul, that "with the heart man believeth (eis) unto righteousness." John says, "whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God." Paul says "being justified by faith." Not one of these witnesses gives the least intimation that the believer must wait one moment for pardon. But all establish the same truth; that he that believeth "HATH life," "is born of God." "All that believe *are* justified." Yet Mr. Campbell has the audacity to say that "it is not our faith in God's promise of remission, but our going down into the water that obtains the remission of sins." Never was there a more palpable contradiction. Either then, the *word* of *God* is *false*, or *Campbellism* is a gross *heresy!* But he not only contradicts the word of God, and the experience of every living christian; he also contradicts himself. In one place he tells us "*immersion alone* is that act of turning to God." Here he says that "*going down into the water obtains the remission of sins.*" How will he reconcile these statements? He surely will not say that the Eunuch did not go down into

the water before he was baptized! And if *going down into the water* secured his pardon, this taking place before his baptism, he could not obtain remission in *that act!* He has labored hard to reconcile Peter at Jerusalem, with Paul at Philippi; at least this was his professed object. His real object was, no doubt, to make Paul say that he meant that the jailor should be baptized for the remission of his sins. Paul, however, continued quite orthodox and not one word could he make him say about baptism as the condition of pardon to the penitent trembling jailor. He still continues to say, (for he being dead yet speaketh,) "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." But Peter (poor fellow) was not so fortunate. On one occasion he said, "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Mr. Campbell not waiting for Peter's explanation, has given all diligence to prove Peter a heretic. To secure this object, he has written twelve volumes of the "Christian Baptist, and Millennial Harbinger;" and published four editions of the new translation of the New Testament, thinking thereby to involve Peter in the same condemnation into which he himself has fallen. But Peter after all the pains that Mr. C. has taken, has given him the slip, come out on the side of orthodoxy, and left Mr. Campbell in

the lurch. He fully manifested his orthodoxy in his sermon to the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius, proclaiming *remission of sins through faith;* and afterward saying that God *purified their hearts by faith.* He has also clean escaped from them who live in error; and is clear of the charge of heresy in the sermon preached at Jerusalem; for after preaching salvation by faith to the Gentiles, and saying they were purified by faith; he fully explains his language to the Jews, by saying that God "put no difference between us and them." Now it is certain if the *Gentiles* were purified by *faith*, so were the *Jews*, if baptism formed no part of the condition of pardon to the *Gentiles*, neither did it to the Jews! If Peter was right in saying to the gentiles *whosoever believeth* in him shall receive remission of sins thereby making *faith* the condition of salvation to the Gentiles, then *faith* was the condition of salvation to the Jews, for in all these things God put no difference between them. The hearts then, of both Jews and Gentiles were purified by faith. Peter therefore, perfectly agrees with Paul that "it is one God that shall justify the circumcision *by faith*, and the uncircumcision *through faith.*" We see then, that instead of reconciling Peter and Paul in relation to their preaching, he finds them already reconciled; and as God has opened the door of faith to the Gentiles; and puts no difference between *them* and the

Jews purifying *both by faith:* neither Peter nor Paul felt disposed to gratify any man so much as to open a back door and let him in through *immersion!*—This work has been left for the present age, to be performed by Joe Smith, and A. Campbell, and it is somewhat difficult to determine which will be the most successful in drawing away disciples after him! And as the attempt to reconcile either Peter or Paul to his system of remission, in, and through immersion has proved a complete failure, we hope that his next attempt will be to reconcile Mr. Campbell, with Alexander, and let us know in plain language, whether it was "going down into the water that obtains the remission of sins," or whether it was the "immersion *alone* that was that act of turning to God." Both it cannot be, because the *one must take place*, before the *other can be accomplished*. These statements can never be reconciled with each other, much less with the word of God.

On the 218th page of Christianity Restored, he asks, "whether if the whole race of men had been assembled on Pentecost, or in Solomon's Portico, and had asked Peter the same question, which the convicted proposed, would he, or would he not, have given them the same answer? Would he not have told the whole race to reform, and be immersed for the remission of their sins? or to reform, and be *converted*, that their sins might be blotted out?—to arise,

and be immersed, and wash away their sins? If he would not, let them give a reason; and if they say he would, let them assign a reason why they do not go, and do likewise." I shall answer only for myself, in reference to this matter, and say, most certainly *I would say*, just what *Peter said*, if I had just such a congregation! If I had to preach to a company of *Jews*, who had been *personally* guilty of crucifying the *Saviour;* had said let his blood be upon us and our children; and in consequence of having denied, and crucified the Son of God, were almost despairing of mercy, hearing them in the anguish of their soul; say, "men, and brethren what shall we do?" I should tell them to *repent* and be *baptized*, (not "*reform*, and be *immersed*,") in the name of that Jesus whom they had *crucified*. That it was their duty now to *confess* him as publicly as they had denied him; that the promise was to them and their children; and they might yet be saved, because the Savior had declared that repentance and remission of sins should be preached among all nations beginning at Jerusalem. I should not fear to preach to such a congregation as Peter had, and say as he did, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, (eis) for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is to you, and your children, and to all that are afar off, *even* as many as

the Lord our God shall call." Such a congregation would not understand me to mean, that "immersion *alone* was that act of turning to God." But that "Godly sorrow worketh *repentance* (eis) unto salvation," that the Savior had been "exalted to give *repentance* to Israel and forgiveness of sins."—That "God had *also* to the Gentiles granted *repentance* (eis) unto life." And "that repentance (not baptism) and remission of sins was to be preached among all nations beginning at Jerusalem." In short, they would understand; (if they understood correctly,) that God put no difference between them and the Gentiles purifying their hearts (not by baptism) but by *faith*.—This *immersion* ALONE, and baptismal regeneration system, is a more *modern invention!* As to the people assembled in Solomon's porch, I suppose no orthodox christian would fear to say "repent, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." We should have no fears that any one of them possessing *common sense;* would understand us to mean repent and be *baptized*, (much less ("*reformed* and be *immersed*,") that your sins may be blotted out. Nor would we have any fear that they would think that the times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord, meant that they should be refreshed by the waters of a river, or a lake! Again he enquires whether we would say,

"Arise, and be IMMERSED and wash away thy sins." We frankly answer, *no*. We would not! And as he wishes to have us assign the reason; if we would not; I reply, because we have learned our theology from the word of God, and not from his DEFORMED TESTAMENT! Neither would we say, "Arise and be *baptized* and *wash away thy sins*," without declaring the *manner* in which their sins were to be washed away; namely, "*calling upon the name of the Lord.*" We have already shown that to forgive sin, and to cleanse from sin or unrighteousness, are not synonymous, and that the cleansing, or washing, was subsequent to pardon. We will notice one thing more before we close, that is, Paul says, we are saved by *hope*.—Rom. viii. 24. Hence it is certain that the man that has *hope is saved*. John tells us, 1 John iii. 3, "every man that hath this *hope* in him, *purifieth* himself, even as he is pure." It is then clear, that after we are *saved*, (and no man is saved till he is *pardoned*) we are to be *purified*, *washed*, or *cleansed* from sin. We may then understand why Paul after being pardoned, was told to wash away his sins by calling upon the name of the Lord. Should we then say to any man "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins calling upon the name of the Lord," we should think there was no danger (unless he was a disciple of A. C.) of his thinking that we meant tha

he must *baptize* away his sins. We should expect to be understood that calling upon the name of the Lord, and not baptism, was the means by which this *washing*, *cleansing*, or *purifying*, was to be *accomplished!*

Having shown that we can agree with Peter, and Ananias, without being inconsistent with our views of orthodoxy; we would enquire if Mr. C's theory will fare as well in this matter. Every person, acquainted with the Scriptures, knows that Mr. Campbell's gospel, is as far from that which Paul preached, as the east is from the west! But there are those who think that his views are not irreconcilable with the sentiment of Peter and Ananias. It has been shown, however, in this essay, that they have no more concord, than *light* with *darkness*. But leaving out of the account the arguments by which we have utterly demolished his whole system; we will make a few remarks in this place, to show their disagreement. Mr. C. says, Christianity Restored, p. 255, baptism is the *immediate* cause of our salvation; our sins are washed away *in immersion*, &c. We now ask in what part of the Scripture, this article of his faith is found? Where is it written that the "absolving, or pardoning power of blood is transferred to water?" Where is it said, "immersion *alone* is that act of turning to God? Not all the ingenuity of

the present age can construe Peter's language into such a meaning as this! Peter says nothing about immersion; and when he speaks on the day of Pentecost of being baptized, he says *repent* and be baptized; not baptism *alone!* And he afterwards fully explains himself, by saying their hearts were purified by faith. And when Peter said, "the like figure whereunto *even* baptism doth also now save us," he demonstrates clearly, that Mr. C. is in an error upon that point; for *he believes* that *baptism* was the means of remitting sins, whereas it is clear that Noah was a pardoned man, and a preacher of righteousness before he entered into the ark. and if baptism bears the same relation to our salvation, that water did to *his*, it cannot form any part of the condition of the pardon of sins. Mr. Campbell then is in error upon this point; and more so if possible in another; for he tells us *as* water saved *Noah so* baptism saves *us;* then very gravely goes to putting people into the water to *remit their* sins! Had he learned his theology from the bible, he would have understood that Noah was not saved by *putting him into* the water, but by *keeping him out;* and that *immersion* was not the means of salvation, but of destruction!—Not only was it the *opposite* of *salvation* in this, but in several *other* cases; namely, the Egyptians in the red sea, and those compound beings that ran

violently down a steep place into the sea and *perished in the waters.*—Math. viii. 32. And even in *that case*, the *swine* had sense enough to keep out of the water until they were possessed of the *devil!* How superlatively ridiculous, and grossly heretical do the sentiments of *Alexander Campbell* appear, when compared with the pure unadulterated doctrines of the *gospel of Christ!!*

Not only does he prove his own views unscriptural, but he would involve as many others as possible in the same condemnation. "All the Apostical Fathers, as they are called; (he tells us) all the pupils of the Apostles; and all the ecclesiastical writers of note, of the first four christian centuries, whose writings have come down to us; allude to, and speak of christian immersion, as the 'regeneration' and 'remission of sins' spoken of in the New Testament." Christianity Restored, page 223. He tells us, they all speak of christian *immersion* as the *regeneration* and *remission* of *sins*, spoken of in the New Testament. Now if the reader will take pains to examine the testimony of these men, even in that *partial view* in which they are presented by Alexander Campbell, he will no doubt arrive at the legitimate conclusion that Mr. C. has borne false witness against them, for not one of the whole number he has introduced, says any such thing. So far from it, not one of them mentions immersion in the testimo-

ny adduced, except Cyprian who flourished about the middle of the third century. But had he succeeded in proving that these witnesses agreed with him upon this point, he would not have proved himself orthodox, but only that he had imbibed the sentiments of those referred to by the Apostle Paul, in Acts xx. 29, 30. "For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." No doubt there was a defection in the early ages of christianity, a departure from the simplicity of the gospel, a substitution of outward rites, and external forms for spiritual influence. Hence water regeneration supplied the place of that which is spiritual, and not content with Paul, to walk by faith, they must walk by sight, and rejecting the doctrine of justification by faith, and salvation by grace, they have devised a method of obtaining salvation by works. The doctrine of transubstantiation crept into the church in the same way, not understanding how they could be benefitted by the death of Christ without literally eating his body, and drinking his blood, they contrived means to convert the consecrated bread and wine, into the real, and literal body and blood of Christ.

They could not conceive how faith could secure the blessings of the new and everlasting covenant,

they must actually eat the body in which he bore our sins on the tree, and drink the blood which he shed for the remission of sins, and instead of understanding the bread and wine to represent the broken body and shed blood of the Savior, have made *that* the *Savior* which was only designed to represent the meritorious and procuring cause of our salvation. So those who cannot comprehend the power of God in confering spiritual blessings through *faith*, believing that these blessings come through the medium of the bodily senses, deny spiritual influence in the conversion of the sinner; reject spiritual regeneration, and have found its substitute in water. Hence water baptism, (which was only designed to represent that influence of God's Spirit which is denominated baptism, 1 Cor. xii. 13. "For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles,") is made to supply the place of regeneration, indeed it is considered by them as *regeneration itself;* and the regenerating influence, and baptism of the Spirit is *totally rejected:* and denied to have an *existence!*

Now whatever they may think of the matter, it will appear evident to many, if not to *all;* that *water* is as much the *Savior* in the system of those who believe in *baptismal regeneration*, as the *bread* and *wine* are the real *body* and *blood* of *Christ*, in the view of the *Roman Catholic*. Indeed they believe

there is no salvation without it, that it is the only door of entrance into God's kingdom on earth. Instead then, of entering the *door* of *faith* which God has opened to the Gentiles, they have opened a *door* of their *own*, by which they let people into *their kingdom;* namely *immersion!*

But why does Mr. C. introduce these men as witnesses in this case? Is he willing to admit their testimony when it militates against his system? By no means! It is true he is willing to have them considered *competent*, when he can construe their language so as to seem to favor his views; but if they oppose them, they are soon pronounced *incompetent*. He can, if he choses, prove that they *always* meant *baptism* by the word *regenerate*, or that they *did not*, just as suits *his convenience*. When introduced by McCalla, to show that infant baptism was practiced in *their* day, and in the days the *Apostles*, Mr. C. objects to the term *regenerate* as meaning *baptism*. When Irenaeus says, "Christ came to save all persons by himself; all, I say, who are regenerated unto God, infants, and little ones, and children, and youths, and elder persons," he concludes that the word regenerate does not mean baptism because that would overthrow his favorite theory of Adult baptism only! On the 367th page of his debate with McCalla, he says, "That the ancients sometimes used the word *regenerate* for baptize, I

admit, but this was far from being *common* or *general*. For Tertullian, Origen, and indeed *all* "the fathers," used the word *baptize* as we do. When it does signify *baptize* in the idiom, the circumstances appended make it evident. And to substitute the word *baptize*, as I have done above, shows when it is not used for baptism, as in the words of Irenæus." Here, he is unwilling to admit that the word regenerate *always* means baptize, but that it does *sometimes* only, and declares that "*all the fathers* used the word baptize as we do." He also tells us that that use of the word was *far* from being *common* or *general!* But when he thinks it would be to his advantage to do so; he can prove *all this* to be an *absolute falsehood!* He can prove that they did not *always*, or even *generally* use the term *regenerate* to denote *baptism*. Then he can prove that they NEVER used it in *any other sense!* On the 226th page of Christianity Restored, he makes the following enquiry of one of his witnesses. "Did all the christians, public and private, and all the christian writers from Barnabas to the times of Pelagius, (419) as far as you know, continue to use the term *regenerate* as *only* applicable to *immersion*?"—W. Wall. "The christians did, in all ancient times, continue the use of this name '*regenerate*,' for baptism; so that they *never* use the word '*regenerate*,' or '*born again*,' but they mean, or denote by it *baptism*." Mr. Camp-

bell positively declares that that use of the word was *far* from being *common* or *general*, then on another occasion calls upon this witness to prove that he had in saying this, declared a positive falsehood, and proves by him that it was in those days NEVER used to *denote* any thing *but baptism*.

Here it will be seen that W. Wall did not testify to all that Mr. C. desired him to. Mr. C. wished to have him say that the term regenerate was used as *only* applicable to *immersion*. But his witness would not; he only testified that it was used in the sense of *baptism*. But how is it in regard to his admitting a witness at one time, and rejecting him at another?

On the 229th page, C. R. he says, "Origen though so great a visionary, is, nevertheless, a competent witness in any question of *fact*." Here he is considered a competent witness in regard to matters of *fact*. But why? Because he thinks his testimony favorable to his views! But how different are his views of his competency when he testifies against him. When Origen testifies that in his day infants were baptized, and that the baptism of infants was according to the usage of the church; and not only this, but that "The church hath received a tradition from the Apostles to give baptism to infants," what does he say of him as a competent witness?—Hear him, on the 369th page of his debate with McCalla; "We care not however, if Origen had men-

found infant baptism in every line in all his Greek and Latin works. He was the patron of error. He was well called *Origen*, for he *originated* more errors than any man named in history." Thus testifies Alexander Campbell in reference to one he pronounces "*a competent witness in any question of fact!*" Let it be recollected that Origen was quoted by McCalla not as expressing his own opinion; but in reference to the usage of the church, and the tradition the church had received from the *Apostles*, to give baptism to *infants*. Debate page 362. If Mr. C. is right in saying that he was well called Origen in consequence of the errors he originated, I would suggest to *him* the propriety of taking the *same name*, for there is not a man on earth that better deserves it on that principle, than this same *Alexander Campbell!* Who can claim *that name* with more propriety than the man that invented the plan of *obtaining* salvation by *water;* succeeded in shutting the door on *faith*, which God himself had opened; and opened the door of *baptism*, proclaiming pardon, and salvation to all that will enter his kingdom by *immersion*. And this is not all, he has invented a plan by which he can pronounce a man who is presented as a witness, *competent* or *incompetent*, according as he testifies *for*, or *against* his favorite notions.

But the most wonderful of all his inventions, is

that of salvation by means of purgatorial purification. He has discovered that there are some sinners whose crimes are so flagrant, that they cannot be pardoned by water; but luckily for them he is willing they should be saved by fire? In his Millennial Harbinger No. II. Vol. II. page 95, 1838. he says, "Before I could esteem such a person (Mr. Crosh) as good company in heaven, he will have to pass through a purgatory of many thousand years." It seems then, that in his view purgatorial fire has not as much efficacy as water, for it will require some thousands of years in purgatory to prepare a man for heaven; but just let Mr. Campbell, or some of his followers, plunge a man into the water and take him immediately out,—and he is as "innocent, as clean, as unspotted as an angel!" Again when McCalla introduces Chrysostom, Basil, Austin, Cyprian, and Justin Martyr as witnesses in favor of infant baptism; Mr. C. sets them aside as *incompetent*, and declares in reference to their testimony that "it does not effect our *views*, nor our *argument*, though they were *ten times* more *numerous*, and *ten times* more *pointed*." On the two hundred and thirty-eighth page in reference to the same individuals he says, "Their opinions are of no more authority than those of my opponent. Antiquity does not, like charity cover a multitude of sins. And *names* as *sacred* and more *ancient* than *they* can be produc-

ed as *patronizing* the most *unmeaning* and *idolatrous superstitions* of *papacy*. We shall only present one quotation from Tertullian A. D. 216 expressive of the vigorous *growth* of wild *opinions* in less than two years after the apostolic age." De Corona Militis cited by Du Pin, page 92, vol. 1. "To begin says he with baptism, when we are ready to go into the water, and even before we make our protestations before the bishop, and in the church; that we renounce the Devil, and all his pomps and ministers; afterwards we are plunged into the water three times, and they make us answer to some things which are not precisely set down in the gospel; after that they make us taste milk and honey and we bathe ourselves every day during the week. We receive the sacrament of the Encharist instituted by Jesus Christ, when we eat, and in the morning assemblies, and we do not receive it but from the hands of those that preside there. We offer yearly oblations for the dead in honor of the Martyrs. We believe, that it is not lawful to fast on Sundays, and to pray to God kneeling. From Easter to Whitsuntide we enjoy the same privilege. We take great care not to suffer any part of the wine and consecrated bread to fall to the ground. We often sign ourselves with the sign of the cross. If you demand a law for these practices, taken from the Scriptures, *we cannot find one there* but we must answer:—that 'tis

tradition that has established them, and faith (superstition) that has made them to be observed."—Then Campbell remarks, "Remember this testimony of this venerable Father, a great master in Israel, and then say, how much is the opinion of any of this or after ages worth on any religious subject not found in the Bible?"

These witnesses (not only *one* but *all* of them) are *quite contemptible* when they array themselves against his *opinions*, but when he can with any show of propriety claim them as favoring his views, even by grossly misrepresenting them, they are without hesitancy adduced as corroborating evidence, their faults concealed, and they are presented in such a light that they will appear quite orthodox, in regard to the system of water regeneration which he so strenuously advocates!

But Mr. Campbell, after attempting to prove that the sentiments of the apostolical fathers were as heretical as his own, tries his hand at the creed of the reformed churches. The reader need not be surprised after his unsuccessful attempt to find in the bible something to sustain his creed; if he should attempt to find it out of the Scriptures. Hear him. Prop. 12. "But even the reformed creeds, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptists, substantially avow the same views of immersion, though apparently afraid to carry them out in faith and

practice."—"This proposition will be sustained by an extract from the creed of each of these sects."

EPISCOPALIAN.—The clergy are ordered, before proceeding to baptize, to make the following prayer.*

"Almighty and everlasting God, who, of thy great mercy, didst save Noah and his family in the Ark from perishing by water; and also didst safely lead the children of Israel thy people through the Red Sea; figuring thereby thy holy baptism; and by the baptism of thy well-beloved Son Jesus Christ in the river Jordan, didst sanctify the element of water, to the mystical washing away of sin; we beseech thee, for thine infinite mercies, that thou wilt mercifully look upon *these* thy *servants:* wash *them* and sanctify *them* with the Holy Ghost; that *they*, being delivered from thy wrath, may be received into the Ark of Christ's Church; and being steadfast in faith, joyful through hope, and rooted in charity, may so pass the waves of this troublesome world, that finally *they* may come to the land of everlasting life; there to reign with thee, world without end, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*"

After reading a part of the discourse with Nicodemus, they are ordered to make the following exhortation.†

* Common Prayer, p. 165.

† Page 165.

"Beloved, ye hear in this gospel the express words of our Savior Christ, that except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. Whereby ye may perceive the great necessity of this sacrament, where it may be had. Likewise, immediately before his ascension into heaven, (as we read in the last chapter of St Mark's Gospel,) he gave command to his disciples, saying, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned. Which also showeth unto us the great benefit we reap thereby. For which cause St. Peter the Apostle, when upon his first preaching of the gospel many were pricked at the heart and said to him and the rest of the Apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? replied, and said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost: for the promise is to you and your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. And with many other words exhorted he them, saying, Save yourselves from this untoward generation. For, as the same Apostle testifieth in another place, even baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ

Doubt ye not, therefore, but earnestly believe that he will favorably receive *these* present *persons*, truly repenting, and coming unto him by faith; that he will grant *them* remission of *their* sins, and bestow upon *them* the Holy Ghost; that he will give *them* the blessing of eternal life, and make *them partakers* of his everlasting kingdom."

"This, (says Mr. Campbell,) I need not add, is in accordance with the sentiments advanced in this essay. What a pity that the Episcopalian church does not believe and practise her own creed!"

What keen optics this man must have to find in this extract the heretical views that he labors to sustain. It is true it speaks of the "mystical washing away of sin" he, of the real and personal remission of sins in water, his language is, "If blood can whiten or cleanse garments, certainly water can wash away sins."—Is there no difference in their creeds? Again they pray for the person to be baptized that *God* may "*wash them* and *sanctify them* with the *Holy Ghost*." Surely this does not mean that they are *washed* and *sanctified with water*, according to Campbell's views. Again, "Doubt ye not, therefore, but earnestly believe that he will favorably receive these present persons, truly repenting, and coming unto him by *faith;* that he will grant *them* remission of their sins, and bestow upon *them* the *Holy Ghost*;" &c. Now what part of Campbell's creed

agrees with this? Does that part which says, "neither praying, singing, reading, repenting, sorrowing, resolving, nor waiting to be better, was the converting act. IMMERSION ALONE was that act of turning to God." Do these articles of their faith agree? If so why do the Episcopalians talk of truly repenting, and coming by *faith*, that God might bestow upon them the *Holy Ghost*? They surely did not mean "that it is not faith but going into the water, that obtains the remission of sins!" If they agree with him on this point, why pray to *God* to effect the work? He thinks it a pity that the Episcopalian Church does not believe and practice her own creed. Why does he not tell us plainly that it was a pity he was not there to instruct them in reference to their own article of faith? And tell them that they did not mean that they were to come by repentance and faith, but by water, to obtain the gift of the Holy Ghost. He next introduces the Presbyterian creed and says. † The Presbyterian Confession, on Baptism, chap. xxviii. sect. 1. declares that—

"Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church; but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his engrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in new-

ness of life: which sacrament is, by Christ's own appointment, to be continued in his church until the end of the world."

"*A sign and seal of remission of sins!!*" This is much nigher the truth than this church seems to be apprised of. However, she cannot believe her own creed; for she does not believe that baptism is a sign and a seal of remission of sins, nor of regeneration, in her own sense of it, to her baptized or sprinkled infants. But in paying any regard to the Scriptures, she would not say less than she has said. (It is no wonder that many sectaries cannot be persuaded to think, that the Scriptures mean what they say: for they are so much accustomed to say what they do not mean, th t they cannot think God does mean what he says.")

The expression upon which he depends to convert them of heresy, or in other words that they agree with him in reference to water regeneration, is, "A sign and seal of remission of sins!!" Now in the name of *common sense* I would ask; how does this agree with his views in relation to this matter? Do the sign and seal of the remission of sins, mean (according to Mr. Campbell,) the remission of sin itself? It will be recollected he is endeavoring to prove that they agree with him; will he agree that baptism is only a sign and seal of the remission of sins? If so why does he contend that they are synonymous?

Because he wished to have us think that Luke meant repentance and *baptism*, when he said that repentance and *remission of sins*, should be preached among all nations! Surely our Presbyterian brethren do not mean, when they say, "baptism is a sign and seal of remission; that it is *regeneration*, or *remission of sin itself* or that it is administered literally to wash away sin! They are not then, quite so heterodox as Mr. C. would have us believe. But he tells us, "It is no wonder that many sectaries cannot be persuaded to think, that the Scriptures mean what they say, for they are so much accustomed to say what they do not mean, that they cannot think God does mean what he says." A. Campbell is the last man in creation that should thus set himself up, as an *accuser* of the *brethren!* With what propriety might it be said to him, "Physician heal thyself." How much more clearly might he see to pull the mote out of his brother's eye: if he would first cast the beam out of his own eye! "Many sectaries, he tells us do not mean what they say." Does he always mean what he says? If so why does he ever immerse for the remission of sins? If, (as he says) going down into the water obtains the *remission of sins*, of what use is the *immersion?* He surely might as well let them come out of the water, as soon as the object of going in, is secured. Perhaps, however, he, like other sectarians, is afraid to carry

out his principle, "in faith and practice." We see then, that the charge he so gravely prefers against others, with the strictest justice, and propriety falls upon himself!

METHODIST.

Having in his own estimation, demolished the Episcopal, and Presbyterian Churches, he attacks the methodist; with the same confidence of success. with which he attacked the others. He tells us—"The Methodist creed says"—"Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin. (and that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and they that are in the flesh cannot please God, but live in sin, committing many actual transgressions:) and our Saviour Christ saith, None shall enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate, and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost; I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bounteous goodness he will grant to *these persons*, that which by nature *they* cannot have; that *they* may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy church, and be made lively *members* of the same."

Then it is ordained that the minister say, or repeat the following prayer:—

"Almighty and immortal God, the aid of all that need, the helper of all that flee to thee for suc-

ver, the life of them that believe, and the resurrection of the dead: We call upon thee for *these persons*; that *they* coming to thy holy baptism, may receive remission of *their sins*, by spiritual regeneration.—Receive *them*, O Lord, as thou hast promised by thy well-beloved Son, saying, Ask and ye shall receive, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you, so give unto us that ask; let us that seek find; open the gate unto us that knock; that *these persons* may enjoy the everlasting benediction of the heavenly washing, and may come to the eternal kingdom which thou hast promised by Christ our Lord. *Amen.*"—Dis. p. 105.

"Thus the Methodist Creed and Church are nearly as Scriptural as the church from which they sprang. She prays for those to be baptized, that in baptism they may receive remission of sins! Does she believe what she says?" What a degree of anxiety he must feel upon the subject of water regeneration, to find it, not only where it is not, but where it is directly opposed. He tells us the Methodist church "prays for those to be baptized, that *in baptism* they may receive remission of sins!" Was there ever a more palpable *falsehood?* The methodist church pray that IN BAPTISM remission of sins may be received! How false! What then does she say? "We call upon thee for *these persons*, that they *coming to thy holy baptism*, *may receive remis-*

sion of their sins, by spiritual regeneration? Is there no difference between receiving remission of sins COMING TO THE HOLY BAPTISM; and receiving remission of sins IN BAPTISM? It will be seen that she does not say receive remission of sins *in baptism*, *by baptism*, or *through baptism;* but *coming to it!* She is not yet, then, convicted of heresy. And to manifest the correctness of her faith still further, she adds, "by *spiritual regeneration.*" This, then, is the sentiment therein expressed, that we receive the remission of sins, by spiritual regeneration!! We are now prepared to answer Mr. Campbell's question, by saying, she *does believe* what she *says*, but *deny* what he has charged us *with*, that is, of believing and saying that we receive remission of sins *in baptism.* We shall not dispute with him in relation to what he says about the Methodist creed and church being nearly as Scriptural as the Church from which she sprang. This is quite a compliment; and had he designed it as such; he would have deserved our thanks; but making the concession as he did, with a design to make it appear that we believed in water regeneration; the only way we can conscientiously return the compliment, is, to express a hearty wish that we could with truth say that *his creed* was a tenth part as scriptural as *either!* The views of the Baptists are correct generally as far as we know in reference to remission; and they believe baptism

to be a "sign of fellowship with Christ, of engrafting into him, of the remission of sins, and of giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to live and walk in newness of life." And now let me ask where is there a sentence in either of the creeds we have examined that would warrant the statement that Mr. C. has made concerning them? I boldly affirm *there is not* ONE! On this point they are all orthodox; *the assertion of their* accuser to the contrary notwithstanding! Luther clearly teaches the views for which we are contending. In his life, published in connection with the Augsburgh confession, he says, "By faith we become the children of God. But by obedience and the works of love, we show that we are obedient children, and receive a good conscience." Chap. 18 p. 135. On the 21st page 20th Article concerning faith and good works, it says. "Faith alone can obtain grace and forgiveness of sin. And when the Holy Ghost is given through the faith, the heart is made fit to perform good works." Thus it is seen that the doctrine of justification by faith, is the doctrine of the reformation, as well as the doctrine of the bible; and to establish the system we are now opposing, would only reform us from Protestantism to Popery, or in other words, from Bibleism to Campbellism!!

He introduces several other creeds and professes to find in them his system of baptismal regeneration.

We have not time or disposition to follow him further upon this subject in reference to creeds and confessions. If he has misrepresented them, as he certainly has done those we have already examined, he *alone* must bear it. If they *agree* in their religious sentiments *with him*, *they* are *all wrong;* and have none of them learned their theology from the *bible.* It is well known that many of the witnesses he brings forward to testify in his favor, not only, did not believe the sentiments he endeavors to force them to prove, but strongly *opposed it!* Is there any thing like candor and firmness in such a course? Take for example John Wesley: the reason we name him is, that Mr. C. frequently claims him as favoring his views (and who will he not claim?)—He tells us that Wesley, in his comment on the New Testament, (page 350) speaks plainer than either the Methodist Discipline, or the regular Baptist Confession. Most certainly then, the Methodist Discipline and Baptist Confession are not quite so plain in his favor as they might be; and may we not say not so much so, as he has tried elsewhere to make us believe they were. Now if we can prove that Wesley not only disbelieved in salvation by water baptism, but opposed it, and preached salvation by faith as the only condition of pardon or justification, no one will doubt but that those creeds which are not so much in his favor may be explained so as not

to agree with, but also to oppose the doctrine of baptismal regeneration.

That Wesley did oppose Campbellism, in preaching the Scriptural doctrine of justification by faith, cannot be denied with any degree of propriety.—We will give an extract from his sermon on Rom. iv. 5, volume 1, page 51. "Faith, therefore is the *necessary* condition of justification. Yea, and the *only necessary* condition thereof. This is the second point carefully to be observed, that, the very moment God giveth faith (for it is the gift of God) to the "ungodly" that "worketh not," that "faith is counted to him for righteousness." He hath no righteousness at all, antecedent to this, not so much as negative righteousness, or innocence. But "faith is imputed to him for righteousness" the very moment that he believeth. Not that God (as was before observed) thinketh him to be what he is not. But as "he made Christ to be sin for us," that is, treated him as a sinner, punishing him for our sins; so he counteth us righteous, from the time we believe in him; that is, he doth not punish us for our sins, yea treats us as though we were guiltless and righteous."

"Surely the difficulty of assenting to the proposition, That faith is the *only condition* of justification, must arise from not understanding it. We mean thereby thus much. That it is the only thing without which

no one is justified; the only thing that is immediately, indispensably, absolutely requisite in order to pardon. As on the one hand, though a man should have every thing else without faith, yet he cannot be justified; so on the other, though he be supposed to want every thing else, yet if he hath faith, he cannot but be justified. For suppose a sinner of any kind or degree, in a full sense of his total ungodliness, of his utter inability to think, speak, or do good, and his absolute meetness for hell fire; suppose, I say, this sinner, helpless and hopeless, casts himself wholly on the mercy of God in Christ, (which indeed he cannot do but by the grace of God) who can doubt but that he is forgiven in that moment?

"Who will affirm that any more is indispensably required, before that sinner can be justified? Now if there ever was one such instance from the beginning of the world; (and have there not been ten thousand times ten thousand?) it plainly follows that faith is, in the above sense, the sole condition of pardon." He also says in his sermon on the new birth, from John iii. 7. Vol. 1. page 404—4 Proposition "And first, it follows, that baptism is not the new birth; they are not one and the same thing. Many indeed seem to imagine that they are just the same; at least, they speak as if they thought so; but I do not know that this opinion is publicly avowed by

any denomination of Christians whatever. Certainly it is not by any within these kingdoms, whether of the established church, or dissenting from it. The judgment of the latter is clearly declared, in their large catechism question 163, 165, 2. "What are the parts of a sacrament? A. The parts of a sacrament are two:—the one, an outward and sensible sign, the other, an inward spiritual grace, thereby signified. 2. What is baptism. A. Baptism is a sacrament, wherein Christ hath ordained the washing with water, to be a sign and seal of regeneration *by his* SPIRIT." Here it is manifest, baptism the sign is spoken of as distinct from regeneration, the thing signified. In the church catechism likewise, the judgment of our church is declared with the utmost clearness: "What meanest thou by this word sacrament? A. I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace. Q. What is the outward part, or form, in baptism. A. Water, wherein the person is baptized, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Q. What is the inward part, or thing signified? A. A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness." Nothing, therefore, is plainer, than that according to the church of England, baptism is not the new birth. But indeed the reason of the thing is so clear and evident, as not to need any other authority. For what can be more plain, than that the one is external, the other an in-

ternal work; that the one is a visible, the other an invisible thing, and therefore wholly different from each other?—the one being an act of man, purifying the body; the other a change wrought by God in the soul: so that the former is just as distinguishable from the latter, as the soul from the body, or water from the Holy Ghost." Here the reader will see that John Wesley did not believe that the sign was the same thing with that which was signified, or in other words that water baptism and regeneration were one and the same thing. Nor did he understand the church of England, or any of the dissenting churches as publicly avowing that doctrine though there were some that spoke as if they *imagined* it. Yet he *fully clears himself* of that *charge*, and shows from the approved writings of the church of England they were not only, not guilty of that HERESY but that they *directly opposed it*, and taught the contrary doctrine, namely that baptism was not *regeneration*, but as separate and distinct from it as the soul from the body, or water from the Holy Ghost. Neither Wesley then, or the church of England taught the doctrine of baptismal regeneration but its opposite, the assertion of the BETHANY BISHOP to the contrary notwithstanding!!! John Wesley is not introduced to prove *any point* of *doctrine*, we *disdain*, such an *effort*, for if the *sentiment* we wish to prove by him, or by any one else,

is in the *bible;* let us go to the *bible* for it; if it is not in the bible, we had best leave it out of our *creed.* He is introduced only for the purpose of showing that we was not quite so heterodox as Mr. C. would endeavor to make us believe. It is clearly seen, when he is allowed fully to explain himself, that *he* no more agrees with Mr. *C.* than with *Mahomed;* and that he had no more agreement with *either*, than the *word* of *God* has with the *Koran, or Campbell's Millennial Harbinger!*

Had Mr. C. given fair play to his witnesses, by letting them fully explain; and had he allowed them to say on until they told the whole truth; they would not have left him a resting place, so much as to set the sole of his foot. How unfair then, to lug them into this controversy to sustain his views, when it is well known that they all preached the doctrine of salvation by faith; a doctrine which Mr. C. abhors as the owl abhors the day. But what else could we expect from the man who would attempt to prove by the word of inspiration tha without water it is impossible to please God, and that, he that is not immersed shall be damned?

We now enquire whether sins committed after justification are to be forgiven on the same principle upon which we first found acceptance with God. This is an important point. We have *incontrovertibly* proved by the *concurring* testimony

of all the inspired writers, that justification, (in the sense of pardon,) is by faith; that to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith, (not his baptism, or faith and baptism united,) is counted for righteousness. We suppose it will not be denied that sin may be committed after justification. If sin *is* committed how is it *pardoned?* We are aware that Mr. C. does not think that baptism should be administered more than once to the same individual. Perhaps he saw that if they were to be baptized for the remission of every sin, instead of standing by faith, walking by faith, and living by faith—they would be under the necessity of standing by water, walking by water, and living by water.

He tells us on the 137th page of his debate with McCalla that God "appointed baptism to be, to every one that believed the record he has given of his Son, *a formal pledge on his part* of that believers personal acquital or pardon—so significant and so expressive that when the baptized believer rises out of the water, is *born of water*, enters the world a second time, he enters it as innocent, as clean, as unspotted as an angel."—On the same page he says, If afterwards he sins through the weakness and corruption of human nature, or the temptations of the adversary, he, in the spirit of repentance, comes to his advocate, confesses his fault, and obtains pardon. Now

I suppose Mr. C. does not intend to be understood that the person alluded to, should be rebaptized. I say, I suppose he did not; for it is hard to tell what he does mean. He says that if the person who had arisen out of the water as innocent, as clean, as unspotted as an angel, should afterwards sin, he comes to his advocate, confesses his fault, and obtains pardon. But what does he mean by coming to him? Does he mean baptism, or does he not? When the Saviour says, "Come unto me all *ye* that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest;" would Mr. C. allow us to come at all, if we did not come by water? Certainly not!! He says on the 214th page of Christianity Restored,—"I understand the "turning to God," taught in the new institution, to be a coming to the Lord Jesus—not a *thinking* about doing it, nor a *repenting* that we have not done it; but an *actual coming* to him. The question then is, Where shall we find him? Where shall we meet him? No where on earth, but in his institutions." And he, in giving us the conclusion of the whole matter, says, "Immersion *alone* is that act of turning to God." We request the reader to turn to the page refered to, and read the whole passage. Here he informs us what he understands to be an *actual coming* to the Lord. That the Savior can be found no where on earth, but in his institutions. This he gives us to understand is immersion;—"Immersion

alone." This is *his method* of coming to Christ; and he will not allow any man to be a subject of *his grace* unless he will come by water. Yet after all this explanation, which he gives us concerning the only means by which we can come to Christ; I think it quite possible that he thinks that there is an other way, and that a baptized person may receive remission without water. Not that I have seen any thing in his writings that might not on his principle, be reconciled with the notion that immersion was the only act of turning to God, whether of an alien or backslider; but having an acquaintance with those who have derived their theology from Mr. C's. *Testament* and *Millennial Harbinger*, and having ascertained their views; we may safely say we have ascertained *his*. And according to their teaching the backslider should not be baptized for remission. Their argument is this, that there is a special act according to the laws of our country necessary to constitute an individual (born under any other government) a citizen of these United States; and when the alien swears allegiance to our government he thereby becomes naturalized, and is consequently entitled to all the immunities of the government.—Should he afterwards violate the laws of our country he is dealt with as a citizen; and would not again have to go through the same process; but still would continue a citizen. Again say they, there is a cer-

tain process required, and a special act to be performed (called marriage) before two persons can sustain the relation of husband and wife, but when married, should they quarrel, and part, and continue to be separated for years, it would be lawful for them (should they desire it.) to live together as husband and wife, without a second marriage. And they conclude that baptism sustains the same relation to the christian system, that naturalization does to our government, and that it brings us into the same relation to Christ, that the woman by marriage, sustains to her husband. But who told them this? In what chapter and verse do they find the proof of this point of their theology? But we will examine the matter a little more closely. Suppose an alien become naturalized, and in consequence of this is entitled to all the privileges of our country; but after this he *rebels*, returns to his native country, or swears allegiance to any *foreign power*, is he still a *citizen* of the *United States?* Has he *now*, although a sworn enemy to our *government* the same right to walk our streets, (and spy out our liberties having taken up arms against us) that he might have had, had he not *rebelled?* Must he not break over his allegiance to the foreign power, and swear allegiance to ours, before he could again be recognized as a citizen? If not, our government has a defect in it which cannot be charged upon the gov-

ernment of God. Again, it is known that persons after being legally *married*, have been not only *separated*, but have had their marriage contract *canceled;* and obtained a bill of *divorcement.* I now ask, would it be more lawful for those whose marriage contract has been canceled, to live together as husband and wife, than for those who had never been *married?* Would it not require the *same act* to constitute them *husband* and *wife* that it *did before?* Most certainly. It is then seen, that their *argument*, instead of sustaining *their theory*, stands directly *opposed to it!* But will an appeal to the Scripture be any more in their favor? Do the Scriptures teach that God does not always pardon sin on the same principle? Is there any remission without the shedding of blood? May not the *backslider*, as well as the *alien*, be informed that Jesus Christ hath been "set forth *to be* a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins, that are past, through the forbearance of God—that God might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus?"—Rom. iii. 25, 26. What would be thought of a Physician, should he find several patients under the influence of the *same* disease, and order medical treatment entirely different, because some of them had been sick before, and some had not. We think all proper judges would pronounce

him a quack! Suppose, then, six men were imprisoned for the *same crime*, and one of our modern would be divines, alias, a Campbellite, should visit them for the purpose of giving religious instruction; but learning that some of them were backsliders, others were not—say for instance, three had professed religion and had been baptized, the other three had not, he tells them that those who had been once forgiven, or according to Campbellism, had been immersed, might by confession and prayer, obtain forgiveness in the prison. But the others, could never obtain pardon until they went to the water. And even then, they would be unpardoned until they were put under the water.—What would be thought of such a religious teacher? He would be looked upon as a quack in theology by all competent judges!! This is no caricature, it is Campbellism to the life! An exact portraiture of the subject of theology as taught by A. C. and his followers!!!

But we are sometimes told that we prescribe the *same* medicine for *different* diseases. We answer, we know of but *one disease* of a moral nature, and of but *one effectual remedy!* The *disease* is *sin.* The remedy is the *blood* of *Christ!* "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission." "The blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin." 1 John i. 7. ALL SIN! Then there is none forgiven without it;

nor is there any, from which we may not be cleansed by it. "Whom God, hath set forth *to be* a *propitiation* through *faith* in his *blood*." Rom. iii. 25.

The question is still before us, Does the Scripture teach that God pardons the sins of the *backslider* on an *entire different principle* from that on which he *first justifies?* They *affirm*; we deny. The burden of proof of course falls upon them; but as we know there has been a complete failure on their part whenever they have attempted it, we shall see if we can sustain the negative. This position is proved first, from the fact that the Scripture equally condemns the sin of the *one* with that of the *other*. "He that committeth sin is of the devil;" "The wages of sin is death;" "The soul that sinneth it shall die;" "Whosoever hath sinned, him will I blot out of my book;" Ex. xxxii. 33. Here it is seen that sin changes the state. If the child of God sins, he thereby becomes a child of the devil. If a person in the enjoyment of spiritual life, sins, that spiritual life becomes extinct, he shall die, for the wages of sin is death! The Apostle does not say it is *death* to those who *are dead*. And most certainly the *state* of an individual is changed when his name is blotted out of the book of God! The *backslider* then, is dead in trespasses and sins, his name is blotted out of God's book, and he is a child of the devil, he does not belong to the fold of Christ, for "if any man have not the spirit of

Christ he is none of his;" And as he sustains the relation of an *alien*, a *sinner*, he must be saved, (if saved at all); on the same principle with that on which other aliens and sinners are saved. This position then, is clearly and fully sustained, unless they can prove that God changes the principles of his government so as to pardon, justify, and save two persons under the same condemnation, and belonging to the same state, by different means. and on entire different principles. But secondly the language of the Savior is clear and full upon this point. He says Rev. ii. 5, "I have *somewhat* against thee, because thou hast left thy first love. Remember from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works." Will any one now say that those who had fallen from their first love, were required to perform another condition in order to their acceptance? Most certain it is, that the Savior required the SAME WORK. Having established the fact that the same work is required of the backslider, that was first required of the *sinner;* we now enquire, what is that work? A. Campbell says, C. R. page 215. "All is mental and invisible before coming out of the water; and as immersion is the first act commanded, and the first constitutional act; so it was in the commission, *the act*, by which the Apostles were commanded to turn, or convert those to God, who believed their testimony."

Mr. C. then, believes *immersion* to be *that work!* Such a work was never required (in order to the salvation of any man), in our Bible. If any man thinks it is, let him find it, and tell us chapter and verse. What saith the Scripture, "This is the work of God that ye believe on him whom he hath sent," John vi. 29. This, then, is the right work; the work which God requires; but very different from that which Mr. C. has enjoined upon us. No work is required in order to justification, whether of the backslider or any other sinner but faith: for to him that worketh not but believeth, (that is worketh nothing *but faith*, or *except faith*, or in other words *only believeth*) his *faith* is *counted for righteousness.* This is counted *for* righteousness to both, to the *one* as well as the *other;* for "God is no respecter of persons." The gospel is the "Power of God unto salvation to *every one* that *believeth*," Rom. i. 16. Here again there is no distinction made between the backslider and others, the expression EVERY ONE will certainly include *every* PERSON in *every* CLASS. A hundred passages might be quoted that are full in point. So much labor however, is unnecessary, if the testimony of God's word is not rejected, this point is clearly established.

So then, we may say with the utmost confidence, that when a sinner returns to God, whether it be his first conversion, or the reclaiming of a back-

slider, that he is justified by faith; and to all *penitent mourners* (whether *backsliders* or other *sinners*) we may say, "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." And in so doing we act upon the authority of Paul who clearly declares, "*All* that *believe* are *justified*." If we turn our attention to the 11 of Rom. we there find this fact most clearly set forth. The Apostle tells us, "Some of the branches were broken off," others were "graffed in." Now as it is a principle clearly established, that like causes produce like effects, and opposite causes produce opposite effects; if we can ascertain the cause of their disunion, or being broken off, we at the same time learn the cause of their union or being grafted in; for it must be the *opposite principle!* The apostle says, because of *unbelief* they were *broken off*. Now had he said because of not being *baptized* they were broken off, there could have been no dispute but that *baptism* was the *cause* of the *union*. But it seems as if the apostle knew there would be people in our day who would not be capable of drawing proper conclusions from fairly established promises; he does not therefore leave the subject until he has set it forth in its clearest light. He says they were broken off because of unbelief, and "*thou standest by faith*." "Behold therefore, the goodness and severity of God;—on them which fell severity; but toward thee,

goodness, if thou continue in his goodness;—otherwise thou also shalt be cut off. And they also if they abide not in unbelief shall be graffed in, for God is able to graff them in again." How then are we to continue in his goodness? Is it by continuing in the water, or in the faith? I suppose that even the Campbellite would scarcely contend that we were to continue in the *water* to secure the favor of God. And yet this *settles* the *whole matter*. If we are justified by *water*, we must remain in the *water* to retain our *justification*, if we are justified by *faith* we must continue in the *faith* or we come into *condemnation*; for Paul says, "as ye have received the Lord Jesus Christ so walk ye in him." This relates to the manner, or means of receiving Christ. If we received him by *water* we must walk by *water*, if we received him by *faith*, we must walk by *faith*. We have learned that we continue in the grace or goodness of God by the same means we first receive it. Paul says, "we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand and rejoice in the hope of the glory of God."—Rom. v. 2. And as we have access into the grace or goodness of God by faith; so are we to "continue in the faith."—Col. i. 23, and "are kept by the power of God *through faith* unto salvation."—1 Pet. i. 5. Paul tells us also, that those who had been broken off, because of unbelief, should be grafted *in*, if they *abide* not in

unbelief, that is, if they *believe* they shall be grafted in!

Language could not be more unequivocal than that used by the apostle in reference to faith being the principle of union with Christ, whether it be the first conversion of the sinner, or the healing of his backslidings when he returns to the Shepherd and Bishop of his soul. Was there not another word in the bible spoken in reference to the condition of pardon or means of justification, this settles the whole principle in regard to *every class* of SINNERS. So that we may say with *boldness*, with *safety*, and with CERTAINTY; "*Whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins,*" Campbellism to the contrary notwithstanding! There is nothing more certain than this, that Campbellism and Bibleism are completely at variance, and directly opposed to each other; *both*, therefore, cannot be of *God*. The inteligent reader then, will agree with the writer, that the bible being the inspired word of God and teaching justification, (in the sense of pardon) to be obtained by faith whoever the subject may be; stands *entirely opposed* to the *dogmas* of *Alex. Campbell.*

Notwithstanding Mr. C's. opposition to the Apostle Paul he pays him quite a compliment on one occasion; hear him, Christianity Restored, page 252. "Paul acts the philosopher fully once, and, if we recollect right, but once in all his writings upon this

subject. It has been for many years a favorite topic with me. It is in his first epistle to Timothy. Now the end of the commandment [or gospel] is love out of a pure heart—out of a good conscience—out of faith unfeigned.' Faith unfeigned brings a person to remission, or to a good conscience; a good conscience precedes, in the order of nature, a pure heart; and that is the only soil in which love that plant of celestial origin, can grow. This is our philosophy of christianity of the gospel. And thus it is the wisdom and power of God to salvation. We proceed upon these as our axiomata in all our reasonings, preachings, writings.—1st. unfeigned faith;—2d. a good conscience;—3d. a pure heart;—4th. love. The testimony apprehended produces unfeigned or genuine faith; faith obeyed, produces a good conscience. This Peter defines to be the use of baptism, the answer of a good conscience. This produces a pure heart, and then the consummation is love—love to God and man.

Paul's order or arrangement is adopted by us as infallible:—Testimony—faith unfeigned—remission, or a good conscience—a pure heart—love. Preaching, praying, singing, commemorating, meditating, all issue here. 'Happy the pure in heart, for they shall see God.'" So says Mr. Campbell. Here is an acknowledgement that what has been a favorite topic with him for many years, and the axiomata of

all his reasoning, preaching, writing—the Apostle Paul, acts upon, only once in all his life! What a dissimilarity there must be in the *feelings* of these two men, as well as in their *principles* and *practice*. One of them mentions it *once* during his whole life, the other makes it a *favorite* topic for *many years*. They are not only dissimilar in this respect but in many others. While one thanks God for the smallness of the number he baptized at Corinth; the other is boasting of the numbers, and thanking God for the success he and his party have had in this matter: perhaps, however, he thinks his baptism of the most consequence, as he baptizes for the purpose of remitting sins, and Paul did not! And while Paul was so heedless as to forget the number baptized by himself, Mr. C. has taken care to publish the number baptized by himself and his followers, that generations yet unborn may read and understand. And again, Paul never mentions *immersion* in one of his epistles, yet Campbell has used the term thousands of times, and makes it the *sine qua non in his religion*, and although Paul expressly declares that God has opened the *door of faith* to the Gentiles. Mr. C. declares that *baptism* is the *only door* of entrance into God's kingdom on earth; and were he doorkeeper we have no doubt but that all those who would enter the door of faith opened by God himself; and were therefore justified by faith, walk by

faith, and live by faith; would be excluded from the kingdom of Alexander Campbell. Notwithstanding all this difference of sentiment existing between these two men; Mr. C. pretends a great deal of friendship for Paul, and would fain make us believe that when Paul says, "Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience and of faith unfeigned," that he actually meant immersion for the purpose of remitting sins. Such an attempt is ridiculous in the extreme. There is no similarity in their *sentiments*, none in their *feelings*, none in their *writings;* while one teaches that there is no salvation without water, and that "going down into the *water* obtains *remission of sins*," the other unequivocally declares that we are "justified by *faith*," and maintains the position by arguments unanswerable that, "*All that believe are justified.*"—The Apostle Paul then, in conjunction with the other inspired writers, has given a death blow to Campbellism; and we presume the reader, if a man of judgment and candor, will be glad to see it *buried* without the hope of a *resurrection!!*

But Mr. C. has seen proper before he takes his departure, to ask a question; and I suppose he considers it an important one. It may be found in the Millennial Harbinger V. 5. No. 6. page 247. 1841. "Is there knowledge, faith, or repentance in a mourning bench, an anxious board, a sheaf of straw, or

an altar of wood? Is there light, or love, or piety, in noise, and tumult, and shouting? A. C." This is a *singular question*, and the man that proposed it must have a *singular genius*. Indeed he must have seen strange things if he ever saw a *mourning* bench, and an *anxious* board. As for the *straw*, I have no doubt but he has fequently had occasion to use it, as it is quite a useful article in building *dams*. But a *board* that was *anxious*, or a *bench* that *mourned*, would be something new under the sun! I have however, seen *people* that *mourned*, and read the declaration of the Savior, "Blessed are they that *mourn*—for they shall be *comforted*." Matth v. 4. But I have no recollection of reading any thing in the book of God, forbidding them to sit upon, or to kneel at the side of a *bench*. If A. Campbell, or any other man has found such a place, I would be exceedingly thankful if he would tell me the chapter and verse where it may be found, and I promise to use my influence to prevent the use of *benches* in any way whatever, from this time forward to the end of my life. For my own part I never saw a mourning bench nor do I ever expect to. I have however seen the penitent trembling mourner, bow the knee before God, at, or by a bench, and cry, "God be merciful to me a sinner." I thought of the promise of the Savior, "Ask and ye shall receive." "Seek and ye shall find,"—and of the declaration of Paul

inspired by the Holy Ghost. "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved."—Rom. x. 13. But turning my eyes in a different direction, I saw individuals under the influence of the views of A. Campbell laughing at those who were seeking salvation at the mourners bench, I thought perhaps they had never read, or had forgotten the declaration of James. "Be afflicted, and mourn, and weep; let your laughter be turned to mourning, and your joy to heaviness." James iv. 9. As for the *noise*, and *tumult*, and *shouting*, whether there is *light*, or *love*, or *piety* in them, I shall not attempt to say. I suppose a *pious noise*, or a *pious shout*, would be about as singular as a *mourning bench*, or an *anxious board;* but I can say with a clear conscience that I have seen pious *people* that would sometimes make a *noise*, and even *shout* the praise of the *most high God*. I have also seen *impious heretics* who were much opposed to such religious exercises, and pronounced it *fanaticism* or *hypocracy*. We read in the 19th chapter of Luke, when the Savior came nigh the mount of olives, "the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice for all the mighty works that they had seen; saying, Blessed be the King that cometh in the name of the Lord;—peace in heaven, and glory in the highest." I have no doubt but if Mr. C. had been there, he would have been among the number

that said *Master*, *rebuke* thy *disciples*. He would most certainly made the enquiry by way of derision "Is there *light*, or *love*, or *piety* in *noise* and *tumult* and *shouting?*" But he would have been silenced by the reply of the *Saviour*; "if these should hold their peace the *stones* would immediately *cry out*. See also Ezra, chapter iii. 11, 12, 13. "And they sang together by course in *praising* and giving *thanks* unto the *Lord*, because *he* is good for his mercy *endureth* forever toward Israel. And all the people *shouted* with a *great shout*, (not a little one) when they praised the Lord, because the foundation of the house of the Lord was laid. But many of the priests and Levites and chief of the fathers, *who were* ancient men, that had seen the first house when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes wept with a *loud voice;* and many *shouted aloud* for joy; so that the people could not discern the *noise* of the shout of joy from the *noise* of the weeping of the people;—for the people *shouted* with a LOUD *shout*, and the *noise* was heard afar off."

In the Millennial Harbinger V. 5. No. 9. page 454, Mr. C. has given a problem for Methodists. This must be his big gun. Hear him! "You say that if a person is only sincere in his convictions, and act agreeably to them, he must be saved. Now upon this hypothesis why send the gospel to the heathen people? It may be a savor of death to,

them, and can place them on no safer ground as respects salvation, for your system is that they can be saved without the knowledge of Christ as well as with it. Will you explain, then, on what principle you send out missionaries, or preachers at home or abroad! Is it to make a party?" He, in the first place tells us, that we say that if a person is only *sincere* in his convictions, and act agreeably to them, he *must* be saved. Very well. Who says they *must not?* Would he send them to perdition on account of their ignorance if they were *sincere* in their convictions and acted agreeably to the best light they had? Or, would he admit them to heaven *without sincerity*, if they would submit to be *baptized* by him? If he would not send the *sincere* to hell, or admit the *insincere* to heaven; his problem will be as hard to *solve* on *his* principle as on *ours.* But what does he say in regard to this matter. On the 207 page of Christianity Restored, in reference to unbaptized persons, he says, we cannot tell with certainty how God will deal with them.—"But I am of opinion that when a neglect proceeds from a simple mistake or sheer ignorance, and when there is no aversion, but a will to do every thing the Lord commands, the Lord will admit into the everlasting kingdom those who by reason of this mistake, never had the testimony of God assuring them of pardon or justification here, and conse-

quently, never did fully enjoy the salvation of God on earth." So then, it is *his opinion* that our *views* are right after *all!* Why then try to throw difficulties in the way of *truth*? Can that man be *morally honest* that will do this? But we see he is willing to admit that God will receive into *his kingdom above*, such as must be excluded from *Campbell's kingdom on earth!* But in his problem, in which he endeavors to entangle *others*, he has entangled *himself*; for not only does he upset his own system, but has also borne false witness against his neighbor! He says our "system is that they can be saved without the knowledge of Christ *as well as with it.*" *This is utterly* FALSE; and he is found guilty of a wilful perversion of our sentiment, unless he can excuse himself on the ground of *sheer ignorance!* I now call upon him for the proof that our system is that people can be saved *as well without the knowledge of Christ as with it!!* Suppose I say, that a person being in a wilderness could find his place of residence by moon light, would it be a fair representation for a person to state that I said that he could find the way home without the light of the sun *as well as with it?* The man that would do this would prove himself *dishonest* or *ignorant!* Because when I said the person *could* find his place of residence by moon light, no man of sense would understand this to

be equivalent to saying that he could do it *as well* as *by daylight*. And a *philosopher* would not understand me in that expression to exclude entirely the light of the sun, knowing that *moon light* is only the reflection of the *light* of the *sun*. If Mr. C. understood the philosophy of *religion* as well as *natural philosophy* he would have known that the light of the SUN OF RIGHTEOUSNESS extends to all; for Jesus Christ is the "true *light*, that *lighteth every man* that cometh into the *world*?" Say not then, that even if the heathen are saved, they are saved *as well without* the knowledge of Christ as with it! Having shown the *futility* of Mr. C's. *problem* for *Methodists*, *detected* his *sophistry*, and proved him *dishonest* or *ignorant;* I will now present one to him for solution. You say "It is not our faith in God's promise of remission but our *going down into the water that obtains the remission of sins*." Now upon this hypothesis, why not let them come out of the water without *immersing* them, for your system *is* that their *sins* are *remitted* by *going down into the water*. Will you explain, then, on what principle you *immerse* for the *remission of sins!* Is it to make a party? We are not ignorant of the fact that Alexander Campbell disclaims the design to *raise a party*, and claims exemption from *sectarianism;* while he possesses a greater amount of *bigotry* and *intolerance* than

those he so freely condemns, and thereby proves himself an *illiberal* and *uncompromising partisan.*

With him, however, we have no *quarrel*, nor would his name be called in question, had it not been necessary for the purpose of exposing, and refuting the errors he is laboring to propagate. Many of his party are no doubt sincere, and some of them may be so deluded as to believe that *he*, and *they* are free from *sectarianism.* This however cannot be admitted to be case with those who have the means of information. They well know that their sayings and doings are as truly sectarian, as any denomination of Christians on earth. Some of them too, know full well, that many of their sentiments cannot be sustained by the common version, or by any fair translation of the word of God. Some have already seen their error, and turned their feet to the testimony of the word of God! Others are wavering in their minds, and although they still remain among them, yet they have renounced the fundamental principles of that system of religion, and firmly believe that remission of sins can be obtained without water baptism. To such we would say, "hold fast your confidence which hath great recompense of reward," "fight the good fight of faith, and lay hold on eternal life." If you *have* been, and *are* justified by faith, endeavor to continue in the faith grounded and settled and be not moved away from the hope

of the Gospel, and you shall be presented holy and unblameable and unreproveable in the sight of God. "Being justified by faith," let us "live by faith," "walk by faith," "stand by faith," that we may be "kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation." And knowing that all that believe are justified," let us, as believers, be careful to maintain good works, adding to our faith virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity, and as Paul declares, "God is the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him," let us continue "steadfast, unmoveable, abounding in the work of the Lord," and then "shall an entrance be ministered unto us abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." And to those who unhesitatingly receive, and adhere to all the peculiarities of the system advocated by Alexander Campbell, I would say, look well to your ways: "Examine yourselves, (not whether you have been in the water, but) whether ye *be* in the *faith*. prove yourselves, know ye not of your own selves that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates." And let us recollect that however earnestly we may contend for what we conceive to be the faith once delivered to the saints, and however correct our theory of religion may be, it is nevertheless possible for us to hold the truth in unrighteousness, as well as to be given up to believe a lie that we might be damned. Let us reflect also that controversy with

us will soon be at an end; and if we are propagating sentiments contrary to the word of God, we are not only opposing the children of God, and disturbing the peace of the christian church; but are actually engaged in controversy with our maker. Let us be prepared against that day when "every man's work shall be made manifest," and "the fire (*not water*) shall try every man's work of what sort it is." "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his." "Ye are all the children of God by *faith in Christ Jesus*. For as many of us as have been baptized into *Christ*, (not into water) have put on Christ." "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body whether we be Jews or Gentiles."—"And because ye are Sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." "Therefore being justified by *faith* (not by works) we have peace with God (not with Campbell) through our Lord Jesus Christ: By whom also we have access by *faith* (not by water) into this grace wherein we stand and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. And not only so, but we glory in tribulation also;—knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope;—and hope, maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." Paul, the inspired Apostle of the Gentiles, and defender of the faith once delivered to the saints!!

NOTES.

Note A, *page* 31.—In Mark vii. 4, in the original (Baptisontai,) is used, which in the common version is rendered *wash.* In Mr. Campbell's new version third and fourth verses, it reads, "for the Pharisees, and indeed all the Jews who observed the tradition of the elders, eat not until they have washed their hands by pouring a little water upon them: and if they be come from the market, by dipping them."—In the latter part of the 4th verse (baptismous) he has rendered *immersions* though very improperly. It may be said that he did not translate (Baptisontai) at all in the 4th verse; but it must be seen by every intelligent person that it must be so understood, or he proves himself morally dishonest in throwing it wholly away. In the 3d verse, he says they *washed* their hands by pouring water upon them, and in the 4th verse he says, "*by dipping them.*" Now if he did not intend to express the same thing as being performed by means of dipping in the 4th verse, that was done by means of pouring, as represented in the 3d, then there is no meaning in language. It must therefore read, they (Baptisontai) *washed* their hands by dipping them.

Note B *page* 72.—If it were the case that (eis,) when it sustains the same relation that it does to the noun in the sentence before us, never means to enter in; still, this would not argue that we were destitute of proof that we could enter heaven; for we find

the act of *entering in*, strongly expressed by the use of the word in connection with the verb, or the participle, as well as before the noun. More than a hundred instances of this, can be given in the New Testament. We will notice a few of them. Matth. x. 12. "Eiserchomenoi de eis ten oikian, aspasasthe auten." rendered, "And when ye come into a house salute it." 2 Pet. i. 11. "For so an entrance shall be administered unto you (eisodos eis ten aionion Basileian tou Kuriou emon kai soteros Iesou Christou.) *into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.*" Rev. xxii. 14. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have a right to the tree of life, (kai tois pulosin eiselthosin eis ten polin.) and may enter in through the gates into the city." Math. v. 20. "eiselthete eis ten Basileian ton ouranon—*enter into the kingdom of heaven.*" See also, Matth. vi. 6. and vii. 21, also xii. 4, and 29—and Luke iv. 16. It must now be seen that to deny that the preposition *eis*, before the noun necessarily means *into*; would not, as our opponents contend, shut us out of heaven! But even if it *would*, I know of no right granted us to assert a *falsehood*, or deny the *truth*, for the sake of heaven! If we have embraced a system that cannot be sustained without concealing the truth let it go by the board; the sooner the better! If immersion cannot be sustained on better principles than contending that the Greek text in relation to the baptism of the Eunuch, affords evidence that they went *into* the water, it cannot be *sustained*. In order to prove *positively* that eis, as it stands there before the noun, means into, it must be shown that it *never* has any *other* meaning; and in order to show that there is

probable proof, it must be made appear that it *generally* has that meaning; and we think that no man of reputation will hazard it, by asserting that it *always*, or, that it generally means *into*, when it occurs, as it does in this place, before the noun only. We have already given a number of quotations, in which it neither *did*, or *could* mean *into*,—we will give one more, which is precisely a parallel case; Matth xvii. 27. "Go thou (eis) to the sea, and cast a hook."—There is precisely the same evidence that Peter went into the sea, to cast in his hook, that there is, that Philip and the Eunuch went into the water. But why all this labor to prove that they went into the water; eighteen hundred years have passed away and this point has not been proved; but if we should even admit that they were in the water; it would take eighteen hundred more to prove that the water was ankle deep; and then, as much longer to prove that one *put* the other *under* the water!!!

Note C, *page* 101.—That to be "born of water," does not mean water *baptism*, is evident from the fact that it is unequivocally declared that a man cannot enter into the kingdom of God without it. This will not admit of a single exception! If, then, baptism is meant, the kingdom cannot be entered without water baptism. This kingdom means, either the kingdom on earth, or in heaven, or in both!—Now I ask, would there not be an inconsistency in saying that God designed that people should be excluded from *one*, and admitted into the *other*? That people *were*, after this, admitted into the kingdom *above* without water baptism, will not be denied except by those who disregard the authority of God's word! Recollect this was said near the commence-

ment of our Lord's ministry, some years before the commission was given to baptize the nations, so it certainly cannot mean christian baptism! Is it possible that any one can be so reckless of consequences as to say, that no man, woman, or child, from that time entered the kingdom of God without water baptism? If so, medical treatment is more needed in their case than logical reasoning! But it may be said, that Christ could, while here on earth, dispense his favors to whom he pleased, and *as* he pleased! Very well! Has he less power in *heaven*, than he had on *earth?* Has he put it out of his power to forgive sin, without the help of a Campbellite?—Has he not been exalted with the right hand of God, "to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins?—Acts v. 31. What now becomes of the argument of the Campbellite, that Christ having made his will and died, leaves all his accounts to be settled by them as his administrators? If they could prove that Christ had appointed them as his *administrators*—that he had died, and was still dead; then we might be persuaded to look to *them* and not to *him* for *remission*, but thank God though he died for our sins, he has risen again for our justification, and is exalted at the right hand of God, still to give *repentance* and *forgiveness* of *sins!* Let then, the quacks in theology, talk of having us come to *them*, to receive *baptism* and remission; we will yet look to him who said that "*repentance* and *remission of sins* should be *preached* in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem."—Luke xxiv. 47. Should any one think baptism is here meant, let him recollect that it is, in 1 Cor. i. 21, expressly declared that "it pleased God by the foolishness of *preaching* to

save them that *believe*." "*Well*," says the Campbellite, "I must say it is *foolish*, *indeed*, to talk about saving people by *preaching*, for Alexander Campbell tells us that "*going down into the* WATER *obtains the remission of sins*," and it must be true!" To all those who are determined to follow his *ipse dixit*, we reply in the language of Paul, 1 Cor. i. 18, "For the *preaching* of the *cross* is to them that PERISH, *foolishness;* but unto *us* which are SAVED it is the POWER of GOD."

In C. R. p. 206, Mr. C. labors to prove that to be "born of water," means *water baptism*, and that *water* is his MOTHER! Now if this be true, who can blame him and his followers for having such an affectionate regard for water when it must be confessed that the Scriptures requires us to honor our father and mother? Christians are content with the *church* for their mother, believing her to be the "bride."—"Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all."—Gal. iv. 26. "And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband."—Rev. xxi. 2. Those who contend that *literal water* is their mother, involve themselves in the following difficulty: 1st. That the water is God's wife; or, 2dly that they are illegitimate children; or, 3dly, That God is not *their father!*

Which horn of the *dilemma* they will choose, is not for me, but for them to say!!!

ERRATA.

Page 26 1st line supply "*to*" after anxious.

Page 57, 7th line supply "*unless I believe*," before, without evidence.

Page 62, 14th line instead of 'know,' read "*knew.*"

Page 69, 5th line instead of 'yet went he in,' read "*yet went he not in.*"

Page 74 2d line instead of 'went to a stream of water,' read "*went to the stream.*"

Page 100 3d line for 'endeavor,' read "*endeavored.*"

Page 102, 2d line for 'give' read "*gives.*"

Page 110, 10th line for 'lighted' read "*lightned.*"

Page 111, 17th line, instead of '27' read "37." 18th line, instead of 'there about' read "there *were* about."

Page 200 4th line for 'unrighteous,' read "*unrighteousness.*"

Page 261 line 17th, for 'convert' read '*convict.*'

Page 267 for 'firmness' read "*fairness.*"

Page 282, 6th line from bottom for 'promises' read '*premises.*'

INDEX.

Opinions of religious controversy, - - p. 3
Introduction, - - - - - - - 5
Mode of Baptism, - - - - - - 14
John's baptism in Jordan, - - - - 40
" " in Ænon, - - - - - 46
Apostolic baptism. Baptism of the Jailor, - 54
Baptism of Christ, - - - - - - 57
" of the Eunuch, - - - - 66
Buried by baptism into death, Rom. vi. 4. - 84
Baptism of Lydia by the river side, - - 94
Born of the water and of the Spirit, - - 96
Baptism at the house of Cornelius, - - 102
Saul's baptism, - - - - - 104
Baptism of the Israelites, - - - - 106
One Baptism, - - - - - - 114
Baptism for the dead, - - - - - 115
Bodies washed with water, - - - - 117
Figure of baptism in the ark, - - - 120
Baptism of the Holy Ghost, - - - 123
Introduction of immersion into the Christian church, - - - - - - - 132
Introduction of immersion into America, - 136
Mistakes corrected, - - - - - - 138
Closing remarks, - - - - - - 141
The doctrine of justification by faith, - - 156
Opinions concerning the means of justification 157
Baptism for the remission of sins, Acts ii. 38. 181

Baptism of Saul. Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, - - - - - 197
Washing of regeneration, Titus iii. 5. - 202
Baptism doth also now save us, 1 Pet. iii. 21. 204
Mr. C's method of reconciling Paul in Phillipi and Peter in Jerusalem, - - - 208
Mistakes concerning 2 Peter i. 9. - - 212
The emphatic question, - - - - - 216
Conversion at the house of Cornelius, - 224
Justification of Abraham and Rahab by works: different means, - - - - - - 235
Conversion of the Ethiopian Eunuch, - 236
Peter's orthodoxy, - - - - - - 239
Mr. Campbell's question in reference to Peter's teaching on the day of penticost and in Solomon's Porch, - - - - - - 241
Mr. C's. statement concerning the testimony of the Apostolic Fathers, - - - - - 247
Mr. C. is willing to receive testimony in his favor, from those whose testimony he rejects when against him, - - - - - - - 250
His attempt to find the doctrine he advocates in the creed of the reformed churches. Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptists, from - - - - - - - 256—266
Extract from Wesley's sermon on Rom. iv. 5, 268
Of sins committed after justification, how pardoned, - - - - - - - - - 272
Mr. C's. views of Paul's Philosophy, - - 284
Remarks on the mourning bench, - - - 287–8
A problem for Methodists, - - - - - 290
One for Mr. Campbell, - - - - - - 293

Date Due

265.17
P241

Parker, Leonard
AUTHOR

An essay on the mode and design
TITLE of Christian baptism.

265.17
P241 Parker, Leonard
An essay on the mode and
design of Christian
baptism.

21302